

# IEEE Guide for Improving the Lightning Performance of Electric Power Overhead Distribution Lines

Sponsor

**Transmission and Distribution Committee  
of the  
IEEE Power Engineering Society**

Approved 26 June 1997

**IEEE Standards Board**

---

The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc.  
345 East 47th Street, New York, NY 10017-2394, USA

Copyright © 1997 by the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc.  
All rights reserved. Published 1997. Printed in the United States of America.

ISBN 1-55937-940-5

No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form, in an electronic retrieval system or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

**IEEE Standards** documents are developed within the IEEE Societies and the Standards Coordinating Committees of the IEEE Standards Board. Members of the committees serve voluntarily and without compensation. They are not necessarily members of the Institute. The standards developed within IEEE represent a consensus of the broad expertise on the subject within the Institute as well as those activities outside of IEEE that have expressed an interest in participating in the development of the standard.

Use of an IEEE Standard is wholly voluntary. The existence of an IEEE Standard does not imply that there are no other ways to produce, test, measure, purchase, market, or provide other goods and services related to the scope of the IEEE Standard. Furthermore, the viewpoint expressed at the time a standard is approved and issued is subject to change brought about through developments in the state of the art and comments received from users of the standard. Every IEEE Standard is subjected to review at least every five years for revision or reaffirmation. When a document is more than five years old and has not been reaffirmed, it is reasonable to conclude that its contents, although still of some value, do not wholly reflect the present state of the art. Users are cautioned to check to determine that they have the latest edition of any IEEE Standard.

Comments for revision of IEEE Standards are welcome from any interested party, regardless of membership affiliation with IEEE. Suggestions for changes in documents should be in the form of a proposed change of text, together with appropriate supporting comments.

Interpretations: Occasionally questions may arise regarding the meaning of portions of standards as they relate to specific applications. When the need for interpretations is brought to the attention of IEEE, the Institute will initiate action to prepare appropriate responses. Since IEEE Standards represent a consensus of all concerned interests, it is important to ensure that any interpretation has also received the concurrence of a balance of interests. For this reason, IEEE and the members of its societies and Standards Coordinating Committees are not able to provide an instant response to interpretation requests except in those cases where the matter has previously received formal consideration.

Comments on standards and requests for interpretations should be addressed to:

Secretary, IEEE Standards Board  
445 Hoes Lane  
P.O. Box 1331  
Piscataway, NJ 08855-1331  
USA

Note: Attention is called to the possibility that implementation of this standard may require use of subject matter covered by patent rights. By publication of this standard, no position is taken with respect to the existence or validity of any patent rights in connection therewith. The IEEE shall not be responsible for identifying patents for which a license may be required by an IEEE standard or for conducting inquiries into the legal validity or scope of those patents that are brought to its attention.

Authorization to photocopy portions of any individual standard for internal or personal use is granted by the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc., provided that the appropriate fee is paid to Copyright Clearance Center. To arrange for payment of licensing fee, please contact Copyright Clearance Center, Customer Service, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923 USA; (508) 750-8400. Permission to photocopy portions of any individual standard for educational classroom use can also be obtained through the Copyright Clearance Center.

# Introduction

(This introduction is not part of IEEE Std 1410-1997, IEEE Guide for Improving the Lightning Performance of Electric Power Overhead Distribution Lines).

Lightning is a major cause of faults on typical overhead distribution lines. These faults may cause momentary or permanent interruptions on distribution circuits. Power-quality concerns have created more interest in lightning, and improved lightning protection of overhead distribution lines against faults is being considered as a way of reducing the number of momentary interruptions and voltage sags.

Lightning usually causes temporary faults on overhead distribution lines. If the fault is cleared by a breaker or a recloser, the circuit may be successfully reclosed. In the past, this was acceptable—but now with the proliferation of sensitive loads, momentary interruptions are a major concern.

Lightning may also cause permanent faults. From 5–10% of lightning-caused faults are thought to cause permanent damage to equipment ([B22] recorded 9%). Temporary faults may also cause permanent interruptions if the fault is cleared by a one-shot protective device, such as a fuse.

Estimates of the lightning performance of distribution lines contain many uncertainties. Some of the basics such as lightning intensity measured by ground flash density (GFD), or estimating the number of direct strikes to a distribution line may have significant errors. Often, rough estimates or generally accepted practices are just as effective as detailed calculations. This guide is intended to provide straightforward estimates of lightning-caused faults.

The goal of this guide is to provide estimates of lightning-caused faults and the effectiveness of various improvement options. Estimates using this guide may be used to compare improved lightning protection with other methods of improving system reliability and power quality such as tree trimming programs or improved protection schemes such as the use of additional reclosers or sectionalizers. This guide should also be beneficial in evaluating design standards.

At the time this recommended practice was completed, the Working Group on the Lightning Performance of Electric Power Overhead Distribution Lines had the following membership:

**Tom Short, Chair**

Ronald H. Ammon	David L. Flaten	Francesco Muzi
John G. Anderson	Manuel M. Gonzalez	Randy Newman
Gene Baker	Stan Grzybowski	David Nichols
Philip P. Barker	Stan Harper	Carlo Nucci
E.M. Berckmiller	Richard W. Hensel	John Posey
Ralph Bernstein	Chris Hickman	Farhad Rachidi
Steve Brewer	W. Janischewskyj	E. Ray Ross, Jr.
Bill Chisholm	George G. Karady	Thomas J. Rozek
Pritindra Chowdhuri	Joe L. Koepfinger	Dr. Mohamed Shwehdi
Enrico Cinieri	William A. Maguire	Leroy S. Taylor
Maria Teresa Correia De Barros	Juan A. Martinez-Velasco	Jeff Tuel
Ken Cummins	Michael B. Marz	Michael G. Vermilye
Francisco de la Rosa Costilla	John McDaniel	R.A. Walling
R. Clay Doyle	Robert E. Moore	Arthur C. Westrom
Ed Dzedzic	Duilio Moreira Leite	Charlie Williams
		Richard L. Zinser

This document is dedicated to the memory of Dee Parrish, Chair of the Working Group on the Lightning Performance of Distribution Lines from 1978 to 1993.

The following persons were on the balloting committee:

Harold Adams	Jerome G. Hanson	Mark Ostendorp
Stuart Akers	Donald G. Heald	Carlos Peixoto
Ronald H. Ammon	W. S. C. Henry	Robert C. Peters
J.G. Anderson	Richard W. Hensel	Trevor Pfaff
Gene Baker	Christopher W. Hickman	Tim Rahill
Phil P. Barker	Andrew Robert Hileman	Parvez Rashid
Edmund M. Berckmiller	Magdi F. Ishac	Peter R. Reed
R.Allen. Bernstorf	Wasyl Janischewskyj	Joseph Renowden
Nelson G. Bingel	John G. Kappenman	E. Ray Ross, Jr.
Steve Brewer	Richard Kennon	Thomas J. Rozek
Joseph F. Buch	Robert O. Kluge	John S. Rumble
Kris K. Buchholz	Joseph L. Koepfinger	Lawrence Salberg
James J. Burke	Nestor Kolcio	Hazairin Samaulah
Vernon L. Chartier	Samy G. Krishnasamy	Roger A. Schoneman
William A. Chisholm	Michael B. Marz	Minesh Shah
Prit Chowdhuri	Mike McCafferty	Mohamed H. Shwehdi
Sam Cluts	T.J. McCarthy	Stephen F. Smith
Mike G. Comber	John E. Merando Jr	Leroy S. Taylor
F. Leonard Consalvo	J. David Mitchell	Dan Thiemann
John B. Dagenhart	Robert Moore	J. G. Tzimirangas
M.T. Correia de Barros	J. H. Moran	S. S. Venkata
R. Decker	Abdul M. Mousa	Reigh Walling
Frank A. Denbrock	Franklin D. Myers	Daniel J. Ward
William E. Feero	Shantanu Nandi	Arthur C. Westrom
George Gela	Jay L. Nicholls	James T. Whitehead
Donald A. Gillies	D. L. Nickel	Charles W. Williams
Edwin J. Tip Goodwin	George B. Niles	Luciano E. Zaffanella
Stan Grzybowski	Stig L. Nilsson	Rich Zinser

When the IEEE Standards Board approved this standard on 26 June 1997, it had the following membership:

**Donald C. Loughry, Chair**

**Richard J. Holleman, Vice Chair**

**Andrew G. Salem, Secretary**

Clyde R. Camp	Lowell Johnson	Louis-François Pau
Stephen L. Diamond	Robert Kennelly	Gerald H. Peterson
Harold E. Epstein	E. G. "Al" Kiener	John W. Pope
Donald C. Fleckenstein	Joseph L. Koepfinger*	Jose R. Ramos
Jay Forster*	Stephen R. Lambert	Ronald H. Reimer
Thomas F. Garrity	Lawrence V. McCall	Ingo Rüsich
Donald N. Heirman	L. Bruce McClung	John S. Ryan
Jim Isaak	Marco W. Migliaro	Chee Kiow Tan
Ben C. Johnson		Howard L. Wolfman

\*Member Emeritus

Also included are the following nonvoting IEEE Standards Board liaisons:

Satish K. Aggarwal  
Alan H. Cookson

Erika H. Murphy  
*IEEE Standards Project Editor*

# Contents

1. Overview.....	1
1.1 Scope.....	1
1.2 Purpose.....	1
2. References.....	1
3. Definitions.....	2
4. Lightning parameters .....	3
4.1 Lightning incidence .....	3
4.2 Electrical characteristics of lightning.....	5
5. Lightning performance of overhead distribution lines.....	7
5.1 Lightning strokes to overhead lines .....	7
5.2 Induced-voltage flashovers .....	9
6. Distribution-line insulation level .....	11
6.1 CFO voltage of combined insulation .....	11
6.2 Determining the CFO voltage of structures with series insulation .....	12
6.3 Practical considerations .....	14
6.4 Arc-quenching capability of wood.....	15
6.5 Wood damage caused by lightning .....	16
7. Shield-wire protection of distribution lines .....	17
7.1 Shielding angle.....	17
7.2 Insulation requirements.....	17
7.3 Effect of grounding and insulation level.....	18
7.4 Shield wires and arresters .....	18
8. Arrester protection of lines .....	19
8.1 Arrester lead length considerations.....	19
8.2 Flashovers from indirect strokes.....	20
8.3 Flashovers from direct strokes.....	20
Annex A (informative) Examples of guide usage.....	22
Annex B (informative) Technical modeling and assumptions .....	27
Annex C (informative) Bibliography.....	36



# IEEE Guide for Improving the Lightning Performance of Electric Power Overhead Distribution Lines

## 1. Overview

This design guide contains information on methods to improve the lightning performance of overhead distribution lines, and is written for the distribution-line designer. This guide recognizes that a perfect line design does not exist, and that a series of compromises are made in any distribution-line design. While some parameters such as voltage, routing, and capacity may be predetermined, other decisions are made at the discretion of the designer. The designer may exercise control over structure material and geometry, shielding (if any), amount of insulation, grounding, and placement of arresters. This guide will help the distribution-line designer optimize the line design in light of cost-benefit considerations.

### 1.1 Scope

This guide will identify factors that contribute to lightning-caused faults on overhead distribution lines and suggest improvements to existing and new constructions.

This guide is limited to the protection of distribution-line insulation for system voltages 69 kV and below. Equipment protection considerations are covered in IEEE Std C62.22-1991.<sup>1</sup>

### 1.2 Purpose

The purpose of this guide is to present alternatives for reducing lightning-caused flashovers on overhead distribution lines.

## 2. References

This guide shall be used in conjunction with the following standards. When the following standards are superseded by an approved revision, the revision shall apply. These references will automatically be updated during the editing process.

IEEE Std C62.22-1991, IEEE Guide for the Application of Metal-Oxide Surge Arresters for Alternating-Current Systems (ANSI).<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Information on references can be found in Clause 2.

<sup>2</sup>IEEE publications are available from the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, 445 Hoes Lane, P.O. Box 1331, Piscataway, NJ 08855-1331, USA.

### 3. Definitions

**3.1 back flashover (lightning):** A flashover of insulation resulting from a lightning stroke to part of a network or electric installation that is normally at ground potential.

**3.2 basic impulse insulation level (BIL, bil) (rated impulse withstand voltage) (surge arresters):** A reference impulse insulation strength expressed in terms of the crest value of withstand voltage of a standard full impulse voltage wave.

**3.3 critical impulse flashover voltage (CFO) (insulators):** The crest value of the impulse wave that, under specified conditions, causes flashover through the surrounding medium on 50% of the applications.

**3.4 direct stroke:** A lightning stroke direct to any part of a network or electric installation.

**3.5 distribution line:** Electric power lines which distribute power from a main source substation to consumers, usually at a voltage of 34.5 kV or less. Note that this guide applies only for voltages 69 kV and below.

**3.6 flashover (general):** A disruptive discharge through air around or over the surface of solid or liquid insulation, between parts of different potential or polarity, produced by the application of voltage wherein the breakdown path becomes sufficiently ionized to maintain an electrical arc.

**3.7 ground electrode:** A conductor or group of conductors in intimate contact with the ground for the purpose of providing a connection with the ground.

**3.8 ground flash density (GFD)(Ng):** The average number of lightning strokes per unit area per unit time at a particular location.

**3.9 guy insulator:** An insulating element, generally of elongated form with transverse holes or slots for the purpose of insulating two sections of a guy or provide insulation between structure and anchor and also to provide protection in case of broken wires. Porcelain guy insulators are generally designed to stress the porcelain in compression, but wooden insulators equipped with suitable hardware are generally used in tension.

**3.10 guy wire:** A stranded cable used for a semiflexible tension support between a pole or structure and the anchor rod, or between structures.

**3.11 indirect stroke:** A lightning stroke that does not directly strike any part of a network but induces an overvoltage in it.

**3.12 induced voltage (lightning strokes):** The voltage induced on a network or electric installation by an indirect stroke.

**3.13 lightning first stroke:** A lightning discharge to ground initiated when the tip of a downward stepped leader meets an upward leader from the earth.

**3.14 lightning subsequent stroke:** A lightning discharge that may follow a path already established by a first stroke.

**3.15 lightning flash:** The complete lightning discharge, most often composed of leaders from a cloud followed by one or more return strokes.

**3.16 lightning outage:** A power outage following a lightning flashover that results in system fault current, thereby necessitating the operation of a switching device to clear the fault.

**3.17 line lightning performance:** The performance of a line expressed as the annual number of lightning flashovers on a circuit mile or tower-line mile basis. *See also:* direct-stroke protection.

**3.18 metal-oxide surge arrester (MOSA):** A surge arrester utilizing valve elements fabricated from non-linear resistance metal-oxide materials.

**3.19 overhead groundwire (OHGW):** Grounded wire or wires placed above phase conductors for the purpose of intercepting direct strokes in order to protect the phase conductors from the direct strokes. They may be grounded directly or indirectly through short gaps. *See also:* direct-stroke protection.

**3.20 shielding angle:** The angle between the vertical line through the overhead ground wire and a line connecting the overhead ground wire with the shielded conductor. *See also:* direct-stroke protection.

**3.21 shield wire:** Grounded wire(s) placed near the phase conductors for the purposes of

- a) Protecting phase conductors from direct lightning strokes,
- b) Reducing induced voltages from external electromagnetic fields,
- c) Lowering the self-surge impedance of an OHGW system, or
- d) Raising the mutual surge impedance of an OHGW system to the protected phase conductors.

They may be electrically bonded directly to the structure or indirectly through short gaps.

**3.22 spark gap:** Any short-air space between two conductors electrically insulated from or remotely electrically connected to each other.

**3.23 surge arrester:** A protective device for limiting surge voltages on equipment by diverting surge current and returning the device to its original status. It is capable of repeating these functions as specified.

NOTE—The term *arrester* as used in this guide is understood to mean *surge arrester*.

## 4. Lightning parameters

### 4.1 Lightning incidence

Lightning occurs during rainstorms, snowstorms, and other natural phenomena. However, in most areas, rainstorms are the primary source of lightning. Storms produce intracloud, cloud-to-cloud, and cloud-to-ground lightning. Intracloud lightning is the most frequent, but cloud-to-ground lightning affects overhead distribution lines. During a storm, power interruptions are caused by wind and lightning. Interruptions caused by wind, trees, and damaged equipment are sometimes assumed to be caused by lightning, which will make the number of lightning-caused interruptions appear artificially high.

In most areas of the world, an indication of lightning activity may be obtained from keraunic data (thunderstorm days per year). A world isokeraunic map is shown in Figure 1. The keraunic level is an indication of regional lightning activity based on average quantities derived from historically available ground-level observations. More detailed keraunic data or maps for specific areas of the world are available. A more detailed depiction of lightning activity may be obtained from lightning ground flash density (GFD) maps, which are created from information obtained via lightning-detection networks. A sample GFD map of the United States is shown in Figure 2.

Lightning-location systems and flash-counter networks have been deployed in North America and other parts of the world. With enough experience, these networks may provide detailed GFD maps. GFD maps will provide much greater detail and accuracy than has been available with thunder data. Location systems





Figure 1—World isokeraunic map

**1989 - 1993 Average U. S. Lightning Flash Density**  
flashes / km<sup>2</sup> / year

Lightning data provided by the U. S. National Lightning Detection Network™  
(Measured Lightning Flash Density Corrected for NLDN Detection Efficiency)



Copyright © 1995, Global Atmospherics, Inc.

Figure 2—GFD map

also provide measured quantities that are more useful and detailed than keraunic data. In addition to providing the frequency of lightning, networks may also provide the date, time, location, number of strokes, estimate of peak stroke current, and polarity.

In some areas of the world, these systems have or are close to having enough data (seven years at a minimum) for design purposes. GFD maps are currently being used for distribution-line design, estimating lightning-caused flashovers, and for many other types of lightning analysis.

The reliability of a distribution line is dependent on its exposure to lightning. To determine exposure, the distribution-line designer needs to know the annual number of flashes per unit area per unit time. This GFD may be estimated in several ways.

The GFD may be estimated from the keraunic level [B5]<sup>3</sup> using Equation (1).

$$N_g = 0.04T_d^{1.25} \text{ [flashes/ km}^2\text{/yr]} \quad (1)$$

where

$T_d$  is the number of thunderstorm days per year (the keraunic level).

Another estimate of GFD may be obtained from thunderstorm hour records [B31], as shown by

$$N_g = 0.054T_h^{1.1} \quad (2)$$

Estimates of average GFD may also be obtained directly from lightning-detection network data or from flash counters. If enough years of data are present, this has the advantage of identifying regional variations.

Lightning and lightning-caused interruption rates have considerable year-to-year variation [B31, B15]. The historical standard deviation for yearly measurements of lightning activity ranges from 20% to 50% of the mean. Estimates of GFD for a small region such as 10 × 10 km have a larger standard deviation of about 30–50% from the mean. Larger regions such as 500 × 500 km have a smaller standard deviation of 20–25% from the mean. In areas with lower levels of lightning activity, the relative standard deviation is higher.

With such large standard deviations, it takes many years of data to accurately estimate a mean. This is especially true when using ground-flash data for a localized region or estimating lightning-caused interruption rates on a distribution line from outage data.

## 4.2 Electrical characteristics of lightning

### 4.2.1 Peak current distributions

From the very comprehensive summary of lightning parameters presented by CIGRE Working Group 33.01 (shown in Table 1) [B51], for first downward strokes, the variation of lightning-peak current  $I_0$  may be approximated with a log-normal distribution.

For the sake of handling the probabilistic distribution of current peak values in a simple way, the following expression is adopted [B4]:

$$P(I_0 \geq i_0) = \frac{1}{1 + (i_0/31)^{2.6}} \quad (3)$$

Equation (3) shows the probability for lightning-peak current  $I_0$  to be equal or larger than a given value  $i_0$  [kA].

<sup>3</sup>The numbers in brackets correspond to those of the bibliography in Annex C.

**Table 1—CIGRE lightning current parameters [B51]**

Parameters of log-normal distribution for negative downward flashes				
Parameter	First stroke		Subsequent stroke	
	Median	$\beta$ , logarithmic standard deviation	Median	$\beta$ , logarithmic standard deviation
FRONT, $\mu\text{s}$	—	—	—	—
$t_{d10/90} = T_{10/90}/0.8$	5.63	0.576	0.75	0.921
$t_{d30/90} = T_{30/90}/0.6$	3.83	0.553	0.67	1.013
$t_m = I_F/S_m$	1.28	0.611	0.308	0.708
STEEPNESS $\text{kA}/\mu\text{s}$	—	—	—	—
$S_m$ , Maximum	24.3	0.599	39.9	0.852
$S_{10}$ , at 10%	2.6	0.921	18.9	1.404
$S_{10/90}$ , 10-90%	5.0	0.645	15.4	0.944
$S_{30/90}$ , 30-90%	7.2	0.622	20.1	0.967
CREST CURRENT, $\text{kA}$	—	—	—	—
$I_i$ , initial	27.7	0.461	11.8	0.530
$I_f$ , final	31.1	0.484	12.3	0.530
Initial/final	0.9	0.230	0.9	0.207
TAIL, $t_n$ , $\mu\text{s}$	77.5	0.577	30.2	0.933
CHARGE, $Q_1$ , C	4.65	0.882	0.938	0.882
$\int I^2 dt$ , $(\text{kA})^2\text{s}$	0.057	1.373	0.0055	1.366
Inter stroke interval, ms	—	—	35	1.066

Description of waveshape parameters (see Figure 3)

- $I_{10}$  = 10% intercept along the stroke current waveshape
- $I_{30}$  = 30% intercept along the stroke current waveshape
- $I_{90}$  = 90% intercept along the stroke current waveshape
- $T_{10/90}$  = time between  $I_{10}$  and  $I_{90}$  intercepts on the wavefront
- $T_{30/90}$  = time between  $I_{30}$  and  $I_{90}$  intercepts on the wavefront
- $S_m$  =  $\tan G$ , maximum rate-of-rise of current along wavefront
- $S_{10}$  = instantaneous rate-of-rise of current at  $I_{10}$
- $S_{10/90}$  = average steepness (through  $I_{10}$  and  $I_{90}$  intercepts)
- $S_{30/90}$  = average steepness (through  $I_{30}$  and  $I_{90}$  intercepts)
- $Q_1$  = impulse charge in stroke current waveshape

## 5. Lightning performance of overhead distribution lines

This section describes how to estimate the number of direct and induced flashovers for distribution circuits. Lightning may account for many power interruptions in distribution lines. Lightning may cause flashovers from

- a) Direct strokes
- b) Induced voltages from nearby strokes

Direct lightning to power distribution lines causes insulation flashover in the great majority of the cases. For example, a stroke of as little as 10 kA would produce an overvoltage of around 2000 kV, far in excess of the insulation levels of overhead distribution lines operating up to 69 kV. However, experience and observations show that many of the lightning-related outages of low-insulation lines are due to lightning which hits the ground in proximity of the line. Most voltages induced on a distribution line by flashes that terminate near a line are less than 300 kV. Flashes may be collected by taller objects, so height and distance from the distribution line of shielding objects such as trees and buildings will influence the lightning performance of the line.




Figure 3—Description of lightning waveform parameters

### 5.1 Lightning strokes to overhead lines

#### 5.1.1 Structure height

Lightning may have a significant effect on a line's reliability, especially if its poles are higher than the surrounding terrain. More flashes are collected by taller structures. The flash collection rate  $N$ , in open ground (no significant trees or building nearby), is estimated by Eriksson's equation [B23].

$$N = N_g \left( \frac{28h^{0.6} + b}{10} \right) \quad (4)$$

where

- $h$  is the pole height (m);  
 $b$  is the structure width (m);

$N_g$  is the ground density (flashes/km<sup>2</sup>/yr);  
 $N$  is flashes/100 km/yr.

For most distribution lines, the structure width factor  $b$  is negligible.

From Equation (4), if the pole height is increased by 20%, the flash rate to the overhead distribution line would increase by 12%. Note that a distribution line may collect many more flashes than would have been predicted by the  $4 \times H$  model, which was used for several years. In the  $4 \times H$  model, the number of flashes collected by the distribution line was estimated by a width of twice the line height on both sides of the line.

The exposure of the distribution line to lightning depends on how much the structures protrude above the surrounding terrain. Structures located along the top of mountains, ridges, or hills will be more likely targets for lightning strikes than those shielded by natural features.

### 5.1.2 Shielding from nearby structures and trees

Trees and buildings may play a major role in the lightning performance of distribution lines. Trees and buildings may intercept many lightning flashes which otherwise would have hit a line. The shielding factor,  $S_f$ , is defined as the per-unit portion of the distribution line shielded by nearby objects. The number of strikes to the line is then

$$N_s = N(1 - S_f) \tag{5}$$

A shielding factor of 0.0 means the distribution line is in the open ground with no shielding by nearby objects provided, and a factor of 1.0 means the distribution line is completely shielded from direct strikes.

Figure 4 gives a means for approximating the shielding factors for objects of various heights for a 10 m tall distribution line. The objects are assumed to be in a uniform row parallel to the distribution line. This could represent a row of trees or buildings paralleling the distribution line.




Figure 4—Shielding factors due to nearby objects of different heights for a 10 m tall distribution line

Figure 4 may also be used for objects on both sides of the distribution line if the shielding factors for the left and right sides are summed (if the sum of the shielding factors is greater than one, then the total shielding factor is equal to one). As an example, consider a 10 m tall overhead distribution line with the following rows of buildings on each side:

- a) A 7.5 m tall row of buildings, 30 m from the left side of the distribution line ( $Sf_{\text{left}} = 0.23$ )
- b) A 15 m tall row, 40 m from the right side of the distribution line ( $Sf_{\text{right}} = 0.4$ )

If the GFD is 1 flash/km<sup>2</sup>/yr, the number of direct hits to the overhead distribution line in open ground would be 11.15 flashes/100 km/yr [from Equation (4)]. With the rows of buildings, the number of direct hits would reduce to

$$\begin{aligned} N_S &= N[1 - (Sf_{\text{left}} + Sf_{\text{right}})] \\ &= (11.15 \text{ flashes/100 km/yr}) [1 - (0.23 + 0.4)] \\ &= 4.12 \text{ flashes/100 km/yr} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Unless distribution-line insulation is protected with a shield wire or arresters, all direct lightning flashes will cause flashovers regardless of insulation level, conductor spacings, or grounding. Therefore, to estimate the number of flashovers due to direct lightning flashes, use Equation (4) for a distribution line in open ground, or Equations (4) and (5) for a partially-shielded line. It is assumed that all flashovers will cause faults on the distribution circuit (see 5.4).

## 5.2 Induced-voltage flashovers

According to Rusck [B45], the maximum voltage which is induced in a power line at the point closest to the strike may be estimated by


$$V_{\text{max}} = 38.8 \frac{I_0 h_a}{y} \quad (7)$$

where

- $I_0$  is the lightning-peak current;
- $h_a$  is the average height of the line over the ground level;
- $y$  is the closest distance between line and the lightning stroke.

Equation (7) is used for an infinitely long, single conductor above a perfectly conducting ground. A grounded neutral wire or overhead shield wire will reduce the voltage across the insulation by a factor which depends on grounding and proximity of the grounded conductor to the phase conductors. This factor is typically between 0.6 and 0.9.

Induced-voltage flashover frequency may dramatically increase for low levels of insulation. Figure 5 presents the frequency of flashover as a function of the critical flashover (CFO) voltage of the line. Figure 5 shows results for two grounding configurations. The un-grounded circuit does not have a grounded neutral wire or shield wire such as a three-wire un-grounded or four-wire uni-grounded circuit. The results for a grounded circuit are for a circuit with a grounded neutral wire or overhead shield wire. The grounded circuit has fewer flashovers for a given CFO because the grounded conductor reduces the voltage stress across the insulation. Un-grounded and uni-grounded circuit structures, however, may tend to have a higher phase-to-ground CFO than an equivalent multi-grounded circuit structure due to the absence of the grounded neutral wire. The values are normalized for a GFD of 1 flash/km<sup>2</sup>/yr and a distribution-line height of 10 m. The results may be scaled linearly with respect to length and GFD.



NOTE—The distribution-line height is 10 m (see B.2 for modeling details).

**Figure 5—Number of induced-voltage flashovers versus distribution-line insulation level**

The results shown in Figure 5 are for a distribution line in open ground with no nearby trees or buildings. The number of induced flashovers depends on the presence of nearby objects which may shield the line from direct strokes. This may increase the induced-voltage flashovers because there are more nearby strokes.

As a point of reference, a 10 m tall distribution line in open ground with  $GFD = 1$  flash/km<sup>2</sup>/yr will have approximately 11 flashes/100 km/yr due to direct strokes, using Equation (4). In open ground, induced voltages will only be a problem for lines with very low insulation levels. For example, the number of induced-voltage flashovers will exceed the number of direct-stroke flashovers for an un-grounded circuit only if the CFO is less than 75 kV (from Figure 5). In shielded areas, induced-voltage flashovers are more of a concern. Typically, an assumption used for distribution lines is that if the CFO is 300 kV or greater, induced flashovers will be eliminated. Almost all induced-voltage measurements have been less than 300 kV, and Figure 5 indicates that a line with a CFO greater than 300 kV will have very few induced-voltage flashovers.

Another factor to consider is that most distribution lines have distribution transformers protected by arresters, which will also provide some degree of induced-voltage flashover reduction (see 7.2). However, this reduction may be small in rural and suburban centers.

## 6. Distribution-line insulation level

This design guide is an attempt to assist the distribution-system design engineer to optimize the lightning insulation capabilities of overhead distribution lines. Most overhead construction utilizes more than one type of insulating material for lightning protection.

The more common insulating components used in overhead distribution-line construction are porcelain, air, wood, polymer, and fiberglass. Each element has its own insulation strength. When the insulating materials are used in series, the resulting insulation level is not the summation of those levels associated with the individual components, but is something less than that value.

The following factors affect the lightning-flashover levels of distribution lines and make it difficult to easily estimate the total insulation level:

- a) Atmospheric conditions including air density, humidity, rainfall, and atmospheric contamination
- b) Polarity and the rate of rise of the voltage
- c) Physical factors such as insulator shape, shape of metal hardware, and insulator configuration (mounted vertically, horizontally, or at some angle)

If wood is in the discharge path of the lightning stroke, the stroke's effect on the insulation strength may be quite variable, dependent primarily upon the moisture on the surface of the wood. The insulation strength depends to a lesser degree on the physical dimensions of the wood.

Even though the design engineer may be more familiar with the basic impulse insulation level (BIL) of a given combination of insulating materials, the results of this guide are given in terms of the CFO of these combinations. The CFO is defined as the voltage level at which statistically there is a 50% chance of flashover and a 50% chance of withstand. This value is a laboratory-definable point. If a Gaussian distribution of flashover data is assumed, then any specific probability of withstand may be statistically calculated from the CFO value and the standard deviation.

As the laboratory data became available, various methods were studied in an attempt to develop a procedure for use in determining the expected CFO of a given combination of insulating components. The "insulation-strength-added" approach may be the most practical.

This method was adopted from a similar procedure used earlier in transmission-line design but has been expanded in its application to multiple insulating components used in distribution-line construction. It utilizes the CFO of the basic or primary-insulation element and adds to that value the increase in CFO offered by an added component (keeping in mind that the added insulation strength is always less than that of the single added element).

### 6.1 CFO voltage of combined insulation

From the earliest times, electrical engineers have been constructing distribution lines using wooden crossarms and poles in series with basic insulators to increase the lightning-impulse strength of the distribution-line insulation. In the early 1930s, a number of papers presented the results obtained when insulators were tested in combination with wood. A question arose as to how much lightning-voltage insulation the wood added to the primary insulation (the insulator). A partial answer came through research in many laboratories, and some

results were published in the 1940s and 1950s [B12]. A general summary of previous works on CFO was presented in the 1950 AIEE Committee Report [B2], and an extended report [B5] in 1956. However, these results applied mostly to transmission lines and not to distribution-line construction. On overhead distribution lines, the weakest insulation is generally at a pole structure rather than between conductors through the air.

More recently, research continued on multi-dielectric combinations used in electrical power systems. These investigations were concerned with distribution and transmission lines and the withstand level of the wood when subjected to lightning, switching, and steep-front impulses [B14, B38, B25, B30, B29, B46, B47, B41]. Recently, polymer insulators and fiberglass crossarms have been introduced to distribution lines [B48, B49, B10, B21, B26].

## 6.2 Determining the CFO voltage of structures with series insulation

Studies have indicated that 1 m of wood or fiberglass adds approximately 330–500 kV to the impulse strength of the total insulation. For longer lengths, the lightning insulation strength of the wooden or fiberglass crossarm and insulator combination is determined mainly by the wooden or fiberglass crossarm alone. The alternating-voltage insulation is obtained by the insulator alone, and the wooden or fiberglass crossarm is considered only as additional insulation for lightning voltage.

When the lightning-surge path to the ground does not include a wooden or fiberglass crossarm but involves two or more types of insulators in series, the CFO of the combination is not obtained by merely adding the individual CFOs of the components. The CFOs of these combined insulations are controlled by a number of different factors, each of which requires individual analysis. Today, there are many different combinations and configurations in use by the operating companies.

The extended CFO-added method may be used to estimate the total CFO of a distribution structure by:

- a) Determining the contribution of each additional insulation component to the total CFO of the combination
- b) Estimating the total CFO of the combination knowing the CFO of the insulation components

This may be done using either tables or curves that display the experimental data available, and utilizing these data to relate the effect of one insulating material added to another. This procedure relies on the CFO characteristic data of the basic insulation and an additional set of composite data given as the CFO voltage added by a specific component.

In configurations where two components are involved, the CFO of the combination is much lower than the sum of the individual CFOs. The insulator is considered the primary or basic insulation. The CFO obtained for configurations consisting of two components is calculated as the CFO of the basic component plus the CFO of the second component.

Total calculated CFO voltage for two components is

$$CFO_T = CFO_{ins} + CFO_{add.sec} \quad (8)$$

where

- $CFO_{ins}$  is the CFO of the primary component;  
 $CFO_{add.sec}$  is the CFO added by the second component.

Total calculated CFO voltage of three and more components is

$$CFO_T = CFO_{ins} + CFO_{add.sec} + CFO_{add.third} + \dots + CFO_{add.nth} \quad (9)$$

where

$CFO_{add.third}$  is the CFO added by the third component;

$CFO_{add.nth}$  is the CFO added by the nth component.

The most commonly used individual CFO and CFO-added components are given in Tables 2–4.

**Table 2—Primary insulation ( $CFO_{ins}$ )**

Insulators		kV
Pin	ANSI 55-4	105
	ANSI 55-5	120
	ANSI 55-6	140
Porcelain	1–10.2 cm (4 in)	75
Suspension	2–10.2 cm (4 in)	165
	3–10.2 cm (4 in)	250
Insulation		kV/m
Air		600
Wooden pole		330
Wooden crossarm		360
Fiberglass standoff		500

**Table 3—CFO-added second components ( $CFO_{add.sec}$ )**

Second component	With first component of	kV/m
Wooden crossarm	Vertical pin insulator	250
Wooden crossarm	Vertical suspension insulator	160
Wooden crossarm	Horizontal suspension insulator	295
Wooden pole	Vertical pin insulator	235
Wooden pole	Suspension insulator	90
Fiberglass crossarm	Insulator	250
Fiberglass standoff	Insulator	315

NOTES (for Tables 2–4)

1—All values are wet CFO levels.

2—Values are the minimum of the negative and positive polarity values.

3—Insulators are shown as examples only. Refer to manufacturer's data for more exact values.

**Table 4—CFO-added third components (CFO<sub>add.third</sub>)**

	kV/m
Wooden pole	65
Fiberglass standoff	200

NOTES (for Tables 2–4)

- 1—All values are wet CFO levels.
- 2—Values are the minimum of the negative and positive polarity values.
- 3—Insulators are shown as examples only. Refer to manufacturer’s data for more exact values.

The values given in the tables refer to wet conditions which is recommended for estimating CFO. For CFO values under dry conditions obtained from the manufacturer or from laboratory impulse tests, multiply the dry CFO values by 0.8 to obtain an estimate of wet condition CFO. Wet condition CFO is typically between 0.7 and 0.9 of the dry-condition CFO.

For components not given in Table 3 or Table 4, the total CFO may be estimated by reductions for the second and third components as

$$CFO_{add.sec} = 0.45 \cdot CFO_{ins}$$

$$CFO_{add.third} = 0.20 \cdot CFO_{ins} \tag{10}$$

Use of the extended CFO-added method and the tables given in this guide will usually give answers within a ±20% error. More accurate estimates are available with the following methods:

- a) Perform laboratory impulse tests of the structure in question under wet conditions. This method will give the most accurate results.
- b) Perform impulse tests under dry conditions, and multiply the values obtained by 0.8 to estimate the wet condition CFO.
- c) Use more detailed component CFOs given in [B30, B29, B46].
- d) Reference other test results of distribution structures found in [B16, B6, B15].

### 6.3 Practical considerations

Equipment and support hardware on distribution structures may severely reduce CFO. These “weak-link” structures may greatly increase flashovers from induced voltages. Several situations are described below.

*Guy wires.* Guy wires may be a major factor in reducing a structure’s CFO. For mechanical advantage, guy wires are generally attached high on the pole in the general vicinity of the principal insulating elements. Because guy wires provide a path to the ground, their presence will generally reduce the configuration’s CFO. The small porcelain guy-strain insulators that are often used provide very little in the way of extra insulation (generally less than 30 kV of the CFO).

A fiberglass-strain insulator may be used to gain considerable insulation strength. A 50 cm fiberglass-strain insulator has a CFO of approximately 250 kV.

*Fuse cut-outs.* The mounting of fuse cut-outs is a prime example of unprotected equipment which may lower a pole’s CFO. For 15 kV class systems, a fuse cut-out may have a 95 kV BIL. Depending on how the cut-out

is mounted, it may reduce the CFO of the entire structure to approximately 95 kV (approximately because the BIL of any insulating system is always less than the CFO of that system).

On wooden poles, the problem of fuse cut-outs may usually be improved by arranging the cutout so that the attachment bracket is mounted on the pole away from any grounded conductors (guy wires, ground wires, and neutral wires). This is also a concern for switches and other pieces of equipment not protected by arresters.

*Neutral wire height.* On any given line, the neutral wire height may vary depending on equipment connected. On wooden poles, the closer the neutral wire is to the phase wires, the lower the CFO.

*Conducting supports and structures.* The use of concrete and steel structures on overhead distribution lines is increasing, which greatly reduces the CFO. Metal crossarms and metal hardware are also being used on wooden pole structures. If such hardware is grounded, the effect may be the same as that of an all-metal structure. On such structures, the total CFO is supplied by the insulator, and higher CFO insulators should be used to compensate for the loss of wooden insulation. Obviously, trade-offs should be made between lightning performance and other considerations such as mechanical design or economics. It is important to realize that trade-offs exist. The designer should be aware of the negative effects that metal hardware may have on lightning performance and attempt to minimize those effects. On wooden pole and crossarm designs, wooden or fiberglass brackets may be used to maintain good insulation levels.

*Multiple circuits.* Multiple circuits on a pole often cause reduced insulation. Tighter phase clearances and less wood in series usually reduces insulation levels. This is especially true for distribution circuits built underneath transmission circuits on wooden poles. Transmission circuits will often have a shield wire with a ground lead at each pole. The ground lead may cause reduced insulation. This may be improved by moving the ground lead away from the pole with fiberglass spacers.

*Spacer-cable circuits.* Spacer-cable circuits are overhead-distribution circuits with very close spacings. Covered wire and spacers (15–40 cm) hung from a messenger wire provide support and insulating capability. A spacer-cable configuration will have a fixed CFO, generally in the range of 150–200 kV. Because of its relatively low insulation level, its lightning performance may be lower than a more traditional open design [B39]. There is little that may be done to increase the CFO of a spacer-cable design.

A spacer-cable design has the advantage of a messenger wire which acts as a shield wire. This may reduce some direct-stroke flashovers. Back flashovers will likely occur because of the low insulation level. Improved grounding will improve lightning performance.

*Spark gaps and insulator bonding.* Bonding of insulators is sometimes done to prevent lightning-caused damage to wooden poles or crossarms, or it is done to prevent pole-top fires. Spark gaps are also used to prevent lightning damage to wooden material (this includes REA specified pole-protection assemblies [B50]). In some parts of the world, spark gaps are also used instead of arresters for equipment protection.

Spark gaps and insulator bonds will greatly reduce a structure's CFO. If possible, spark gaps, insulator bonds, and pole-protection assemblies should not be used to prevent wood damage. Better solutions for damage to wood and pole fires are local insulator-wood bonds at the base of the insulator as discussed in 5.5.

## 6.4 Arc-quenching capability of wood

Wood poles and crossarms have shown the capability to quench the lightning-caused arc and prevent it from forming a power-frequency fault [B16, B6, B15].

The arc-quenching capabilities of wood are predominantly a function of the instantaneous power-frequency voltage across the arc at the instant of the lightning-caused flashover. If the voltage is near a zero crossing,

the arc is much more likely to extinguish without causing a fault. If the nominal voltage along the wooden crossarm is maintained below a certain level, the chance of a fault developing may be greatly reduced.

If multiple flashovers occur, arc quenching is much less likely (see Figure 6). Most distribution lines will suffer multiple flashovers from a direct strike. On distribution structures that have RMS voltage gradients across wood greater than 10 kV/m of wood, arc quenching may not provide significant benefit. For example, a 13.2 kV distribution line with 0.5 m of wood between the phase insulator and the neutral wire has an RMS voltage gradient across the wood of  $132 \text{ kV} / \sqrt{3} / 0.5 \text{ m} = 15.2 \text{ kV} / \text{m}$ . For this voltage, if wooden spacings of 1 m are achieved between all phase conductors and all grounded objects on the pole, then arc quenching may become a significant factor. This may be readily achieved on circuits with high insulation levels and long distances of wood. For this guide, a conservative assumption is made that all flashovers cause faults.




Figure 6—Probability of a power arc due to a lightning flashover over a wet wooden crossarm [B16]

## 6.5 Wood damage caused by lightning

Service experience indicates that damage to poles or crossarms due to lightning is relatively rare [B15]. Nevertheless, in high-lightning areas it may be a concern under certain conditions. The probability of damage due to lightning depends on many factors, especially the moisture content and aging of the wood. Damage and shattering occurs when the breakdown is internal to the wood rather than along the surface of the wood. If the wood is green, it is more likely to breakdown internally.

If historical records show that wood damage is a problem, the wood may be protected by bonding the insulators. However, this short circuits the insulation capability provided by the wood. A better solution may be to use surface electrodes fitted near the insulator pin. This may include wire-wraps, bands, or other metal extensions attached near the insulator in the likely direction of flashover. This encourages breakdown near the surface rather than internally.

Preventative measures for lightning damage to wood will also reduce the likelihood of pole-top fires. Pole-top fires are the result of leakage-current arcs at metal-to-wood interfaces [B42, B15]. Local bonding, using wire bands or wraps, will bridge the location where fires are most likely to start at poor metal-to-wood contacts. This is preferable to completely bonding the insulators (see 5.3, last paragraph).

## 7. Shield-wire protection of distribution lines

Shield wires are grounded conductors placed above the phase conductors to intercept lightning strokes which would otherwise directly strike the phases. Lightning current is diverted to ground through a pole ground lead. To be effective, the shield wire is grounded at every pole.

Lightning-surge current flowing through the pole ground impedance causes a potential rise, resulting in a large voltage difference between the ground lead and the phase conductors. The voltage difference may cause a back flashover across the insulation from the ground lead to one of the phase conductors.

The back flashover phenomenon is a substantial constraint to shield-wire effectiveness in distribution-line applications. Shield wires may provide effective protection only if

- a) Good insulation design practices are used to provide sufficient CFO between the ground downlead and the phase conductors.
- b) Low pole ground resistances are obtained.

Figure 5 may be used to estimate the number of induced flashovers for a shield-wire design. For three-wire distribution circuits, adding a shield wire will reduce the number of induced flashovers. Since the shield wire is grounded, it will suppress the voltages on the phase conductors through capacitive coupling. The closer the phase wires are to the shield wire, the better the coupling, and the smaller the induced voltages will be (although this may reduce the CFO, as discussed in 5.3). Note that adding a grounded wire below the phase conductors will have approximately the same effect as an overhead shield wire.

On a four-wire, multigrounded system, replacing the underbuilt neutral wire with an overhead shield wire will not reduce the number of induced flashovers. However, having both a shield wire and a neutral wire will improve performance to some degree.


The cost of including a shield wire in a distribution-line design may be substantial. In addition to the cost of the conductor, pole grounds, and additional insulation, the pole heights must be greater to support the shield wire such that there is a sufficient shielding angle between the shield wire and the outer phase conductors. The greater structure height attracts more direct strokes, and this slightly offsets some of the flashover rate reduction provided by the shielding. Despite the cost and design difficulties, shield wires have been used by some utilities with great success.

### 7.1 Shielding angle

To ensure that all lightning strokes terminate on the shield wire rather than on the phase conductors, a shielding angle (as shown by Figure 7) of  $45^\circ$  or less is recommended. This is only valid for lines less than 15 m tall with conductor spacings under 2 m. Taller lines require smaller shielding angles. Refer to IEEE Std 1243-1997 [B27]

### 7.2 Insulation requirements

Shield-wire effectiveness in distribution lines depends greatly on the insulation provided between the ground lead and the phase conductors. If the ground lead is in contact with the pole for its entire height, it is difficult to provide adequate insulation. On a wooden pole, it is usually necessary to isolate the ground lead from the pole in the vicinity of the phase insulators and crossarms. This may be accomplished by fiberglass rods, or standoffs mounted horizontally on the pole to hold the ground wire 30–60 cm away from the pole. The CFO from the ground lead to the closest phase is the most limiting value from several paths. Care should also be taken to insulate guy wires to obtain the necessary CFO.



**Figure 7—Shield-wire shielding angle**

A CFO in excess of 250–300 kV is necessary to make shield-wire application effective. By using ground-lead standoffs, it is not difficult to achieve this insulation level on distribution lines.


### **7.3 Effect of grounding and insulation level**

Shield-wire effectiveness is highly dependent on grounding. For a shield-wire design to be effective, ground resistances must be less than  $10\ \Omega$  if the CFO is less than 200 kV. If attention is given to insulation level and the CFO is 300–350 kV, a ground resistance of  $40\ \Omega$  will provide similar performance. The shield wire should be grounded at every pole for effective results. Figure 8 shows the direct-stroke performance and effect of grounding with an example computer simulation of a shield wire with CFOs of 175 kV and 350 kV.

Distribution lines underbuilt on transmission structures may be especially susceptible to back flashovers. Greater structure heights and larger right-of-ways will draw more direct strikes to the structures. Care must be taken to maintain high insulation levels to avoid unnaturally high flashover rates.

### **7.4 Shield wires and arresters**

To virtually eliminate flashovers, arresters on every pole and every phase may be used in conjunction with a shield wire. The arresters will protect the insulation from back flashover. The shield wire will divert most of the current to the ground, so the arresters are not subject to much energy input. The arresters make the shield-wire design less dependent on insulation level and grounding.



NOTE—Span length is 75 m (see B.3 for modeling details).

**Figure 8—Effect of grounding resistance on shield-wire performance (direct strokes)**

## 8. Arrester protection of lines

Distribution arresters are used effectively to protect equipment insulation such as transformers and regulators. These arresters function as high impedances at normal operating voltages and become low impedances during lightning-surge conditions. The arrester conducts surge current to the ground while limiting the voltage on the equipment to the sum of the discharge voltage of the arrester plus the inductive voltage developed by the discharge current in arrester line and ground leads.

Arresters may be used to protect distribution-line insulation to prevent flashovers and circuit interruptions. Several different types of arresters are available (e.g., gapped silicon carbide, gapped or non-gapped metal-oxide). From the point of view of protection of distribution-line insulation, all perform in a similar manner. Differences in discharge voltage characteristics will cause only a small difference in the protection of insulation, since there is considerable margin.

For selection of arrester rating, refer to IEEE Std C62.22-1991 or the manufacturer's guidelines. For equipment protection (especially underground cables), it is sometimes necessary to select an arrester with the lowest possible protective level. However, for line-insulation protection, this is not usually necessary because the arrester protective level is generally considerably lower than the line-insulation level.

When applying arresters for protection, the failure rate of the added arresters should be considered along with the line-flashover improvement obtained by adding the arresters.


### 8.1 Arrester lead length considerations

Arrester leads that connect the distribution line and ground terminals of arresters to the equipment they protect contain a small amount of inherent inductance. This inductance may cause  $L(di/dt)$  voltage drops to appear across the leads that conduct lightning-surge currents. Any voltage drop across an arrester lead will add to the arrester discharge voltage. This will increase the voltage appearing across the device(s) protected by the arrester.

The effect of the line-lead length on the protection of the distribution-line insulation is not as significant as it is with equipment protection. For overhead equipment, margin is generally very high. Also, line insulation is generally much larger than standard equipment BIL. Of course, it is always good practice to keep arrester distribution line and ground leads as short and straight as possible. Refer to IEEE Std C62.22-1991 for more information on arrester lead lengths.

## 8.2 Flashovers from indirect strokes

Arresters may greatly reduce the flashover rate due to induced voltages from nearby strokes. Figure 9 shows results for an insulation level of 150 kV for an un-grounded circuit. Note that even relatively wide arrester spacings may reduce induced-voltage flashovers significantly (8 spans yields at least a 25% reduction). On many distribution circuits with frequent transformers, the arresters used to protect the transformers may provide significant protection from induced flashovers. The technical assumptions are described in Annex B.



NOTE—(CFO = 150 kV, h = 10 m,  $N_g = 1$  flash/km<sup>2</sup>/yr, span length = 75 m)

**Figure 9—Arrester spacing for flashovers from induced voltages**


Arresters may be even more effective at reducing induced flashovers if they are used to protect poles with poor insulation levels. These “weak links” may include cut-outs, dead-end poles, or crossover poles. Placing arresters on these poles may be more cost-effective than improving the insulation level.

## 8.3 Flashovers from direct strokes

Protecting against direct strokes is difficult because of the high surge currents, steep rates of rise, and large energy content in lightning flashes. In theory, arresters may effectively protect against direct strikes, but they must be used at very close intervals (virtually every pole). Figure 10 shows estimates for arrester spacing to protect against direct strokes (see the Annex B for details and assumptions). The analysis in Figure 10 assumes that the neutral wire is grounded at every pole. The high number of flashovers may be misleading according to Figure 10, where the neutral wire is not grounded, except at poles where arresters are applied to all phases, and the neutral-to-ground insulation level is high.

### 8.3.1 Top-phase arrester protection

If the top-phase conductor is situated such that it will intercept all lightning strokes, arresters may be applied to the top phase which makes it act like a shield wire. Upon being struck, the top-phase arrester will conduct



NOTE—Span length is 75 m.

**Figure 10—Arrester spacing for direct-stroke protection**

the surge-to-ground. The circuit will be protected if the ground resistance is low enough and the insulation on the unprotected phases is high enough. Like a shield wire, care should be taken to maintain high insulation level on the unprotected phases. The curves for a shield wire (see Figure 8) may be used to estimate the effectiveness of a top-phase arrester design. The arresters should be used on virtually every pole or tower to achieve optimum protection.

### 8.3.2 Arrester direct-stroke capability

In exposed applications (e.g., a distribution line in the open without a shield wire), distribution-class and metal-oxide arresters may suffer occasional failures due to direct strokes. Reference [B33] has shown that a significant percentage of direct lightning flashes may cause arresters to absorb energy in excess of both the manufacturer's published capability and the 4/10  $\mu$ s discharge test wave. This is tempered by the fact that metal-oxide blocks have been shown to have appreciably more surge-energy absorption capability than the published capability [B40]. Another failure mechanism of some metal-oxide arrester designs is the occurrence of flashovers around the blocks when the arrester is subjected to multiple-stroke events [B17]. Surface flashovers due to multiple strokes are much less likely for arresters without air spacings such as polymer-housed arresters [B18].

## Annex A

(informative)

### Examples of guide usage

#### A.1 Example 1 — 15 kV wooden crossarm design

Problem: a utility is performing a review of its standard 15 kV class, three-wire distribution-line design (see Figure A.1). The utility is in a moderate lightning area with a keraunic level of 40 thunderstorm days per year. Insulators are ANSI-class 55-4, porcelain-pin insulators. Assume that the crossarm braces are conducting and steel insulator pins are used. Guy wires have porcelain-strain insulators (ANSI-class 54-4). The standard pole size is 12.2 m with a planting depth of 2 m. The goal is to estimate the lightning performance level of the current design and investigate improvements.




Figure A.1 — 15 kV class wooden crossarm design

*Insulation level.* The CFO for several possible flashover paths are shown in Table A.1.

*Direct strokes.* The GFD may be estimated from the keraunic level

$$N_g = 0.04 (40)^{1.25} = 4 \text{ flashes/km}^2/\text{yr}$$

The top conductor height is 10.2 m with a structure width of 2.24 m. From Equation (4), the number of direct flashes in open ground is

$$N = 4 [28(10.2)^{0.6} + 2.24]/10 = 46 \text{ flashes/100 km/yr}$$

**Table A.1—CFO calculations for several possible flashover paths for the 15 kV pole design**

From	To	Flashover path	Total CFO [kV]
Middle phase	Guy wire	Insulators (105 kV) to 0.2 m wooden pole (47 kV) to guy insulator (0 kV)	152
Outer phase	Guy wire	Insulator (105 kV) to 0.6 m wooden crossarm (150 kV) to 0.2 m wooden pole (13 kV) to guy insulator (0 kV)	268
Right phase	Middle phase	Insulator (105 kV) 0.6 m wooden crossarm(150 kV) to second insulator (20 kV)	275
Right phase	Middle phase	Air	360

Assuming a 0.75 shielding factor, and that all direct strokes will cause a flashover, the estimated number of direct-hit flashovers are:

$$\text{Direct-hit flashovers} = 11.5 \text{ flashovers}/100 \text{ km/yr}$$

*Induced flashovers.* The number of induced flashovers in open ground may be estimated from Figure 5 using the lowest CFO path of 152 kV and scaling by the GFD:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Induced flashovers (open ground)} &= (4)2 \text{ flashes}/100 \text{ km/yr} \\ &= 8 \text{ flashovers}/100 \text{ km/yr} \end{aligned}$$

Because much of the distribution line is shielded (bordered by tall structures, e.g.,  $S_f = 0.75$ ), larger magnitude strokes can terminate close to the line, without striking the distribution line directly. This will cause more induced flashovers. The number of induced-voltage flashovers should be somewhere between the number of indirect flashovers in open ground (8 flashes/100 km/yr in this case) and the number of direct hits in open ground (46 flashes/100 km/yr in this case). As an estimate, we will assume that the induced-voltage flashovers are two times the induced flashovers in open ground.

$$\text{Induced flashovers} = 16 \text{ flashovers}/100 \text{ km/yr}$$

All flashovers are assumed to cause faults, as show by

$$\text{Total faults} = \text{direct} + \text{induced} = 27.5 \text{ faults}/100 \text{ km/yr}$$

*Improvement options to consider.* It has been decided to consider changes that are relatively inexpensive and easy to implement. Insulation changes to reduce induced-voltage flashovers are the primary consideration with a goal of a 300 kV CFO.

- Use 50 cm fiberglass guy-strain insulators. This will increase the middle phase-to-guy CFO to 310 kV [0.5 m fiberglass guy-strain insulator (250 kV) + insulator ( $0.45 \cdot 105 \text{ kV} = 47 \text{ kV}$ ) + 0.2 m wooden pole ( $0.2 \text{ m} \cdot 65 \text{ kV/m} = 13 \text{ kV}$ )]. This virtually eliminates induced-voltage flashovers.
- Use wooden crossarm braces. This will add a significant amount of wood to the middle phase-to-guy flashover path. The CFO along this path would be approximately 255 kV [insulator (105 kV) + wooden crossarm ( $0.52 \text{ m} \cdot 250 \text{ kV/m} = 130 \text{ kV}$ ) + wooden pole ( $0.3 \text{ m} \cdot 65 \text{ kV/m} = 20 \text{ kV}$ )]. This reduces the number of induced-voltage flashovers to less than 0.8 flashovers/100 km/yr.

Other structure designs such as dead-end, angle, and crossover should also be examined. Improvement options may then be cost-compared to the existing design and against the improvement in service reliability and power quality.

## A.2 Example 2—35 kV distribution line with a shield wire

Problem: a utility is considering using a shielded distribution-line design for its 35 kV four-wire multi-grounded neutral circuits (see Figure A.2). The line will be built in an area with a shielding factor of 0.5 provided by nearby objects and a keraunic level of 60 thunderstorm days per year. The design provides a shielding angle of  $24^\circ$ . The phase insulators are ANSI-class 57-2, porcelain-post insulators on steel brackets. The shield wire is supported by an ANSI-class 55-5, pin-porcelain insulator. The distribution line uses 15.24 m wooden poles, and every pole is grounded with a ground resistance of  $10 \Omega$  or less.




Figure A.2—35 kV shield wire wooden pole structure

From the CFO calculations in Table A.2, it is obvious that the fiberglass ground-lead standoffs are needed. The pole ground lead wire is offset with a 0.46 m fiberglass standoff insulator, and it is attached to the pole 0.49 m below the bottom phase conductor. Without the standoffs, the CFO would be 180 kV, which would lead to induced-voltage flashovers, and the shield wire would not be effective at preventing direct-stroke flashovers. Although the lowest CFO path is 261 kV, the paths of most concern are the phase-to-ground flashover paths, because the voltage for a stroke to the shield wire and induced voltages are phase-to-ground voltage stresses. The lowest phase-to-ground flashover path is 325 kV from phase C to the pole ground lead.

**Table A.2—35 kV shield wire CFOs**

From	To	Flashover path	Total CFO (kV)
Ground wire	A, B, C	Post insulator (with no ground-wire standoff)	180
Static	A, B	Post insulator (180 kV) to 0.91 m wooden pole (214 kV) to pin insulator (24 kV)	418
Static	C	Post insulator (180 kV) to 2.13 m wooden pole (501 kV) to pin insulator (24 kV)	705
A	B	First post insulator (180 kV) to second post insulator (81 kV)	261
A, B	C	First post insulator (180 kV) to 0.91 m wooden pole (214 kV) to second post insulator (36 kV)	430
Pole ground lead	C	Post insulator (180 kV) to standoff (145 kV)	325
Pole ground lead	A, B	Post insulator (180 kV) to 0.8 m wooden pole (188 kV) to standoff (92 kV)	460
Pole ground lead	A, B, C	0.75 m air (450 kV)	450

*Direct hits.* The GFD may be estimated from the keraunic level in the following equation:

$$N_g = 0.04(60)^{1.25} = 6.68 \text{ flashes/km}^2/\text{yr}$$

The shield-wire height is 13.13 m, the width of the phase conductors is 1.22 m. From Equation (4), the number of direct flashes in open ground is

$$N = 6.68[(28 \times 13.13^{0.6})/10] = 87.7 \text{ flashes/100 km/yr}$$

The estimated hits using a shielding factor of 0.5 is:

$$\text{Direct hits to the distribution line} = 43.8 \text{ flashes/100 km/yr}$$

Because the distribution line is grounded at every pole and the shielding angle is less than  $45^\circ$ , all flashes to the distribution line are assumed to strike the shield wire. The number of flashovers may be determined from Figure 8 with a ground resistance of  $10 \Omega$  using the 350 kV CFO curve.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Direct-hit flashovers} &= (43.8 \text{ flashes/100 km/yr})(4\% \text{ flashover rate}) \\ &= 1.8 \text{ flashovers/100 km/yr} \end{aligned}$$

*Induced flashovers.* With a CFO of 325 kV, the structure may be assumed to be immune from induced-voltage flashovers (it is off of the graph in Figure 5).

All flashovers are then due to direct strokes, and all flashovers are assumed to cause faults, as shown by

$$\text{Total faults} = \text{direct} = 1.8 \text{ faults/100 km/yr}$$

*Improvement options to consider.* The design shown in Figure A.2 has very good flashover performance. One concern is that the design goal of 10  $\Omega$  grounding impedance may be difficult to achieve in practice. Figure 8 may be used to estimate the reduction in performance due to the footing impedance. For example, if the footing impedance is 50  $\Omega$ , the flashover rate will increase to 35% of direct hits (15.3 faults/100 km/yr).

An improvement option to consider would be using fiberglass insulator brackets instead of the steel brackets specified. This would increase the phase-to-phase and phase-to-ground CFO.

When comparing this design to non-shielded designs, the increase in construction cost should be weighed against the mitigated cost of the power interruptions caused by flashovers.

## Annex B

(informative)

### Technical modeling and assumptions

#### B.1 Shielding

An electrogeometric model may be used to estimate the shielding factor for a specific portion of a distribution line. An electrogeometric model is based on the idea that a distribution line or other object has a certain attractive radius which increases with height, and also the attractive radius is dependent on the current magnitude in the lightning flash. Although several models have been proposed, the equation used for the calculation of the striking distances is the equation adopted by the IEEE Working Group on Estimating the Lightning Performance of Transmission lines [B28], given by Equation (B.1).

$$r_s = 10 \cdot I_O^{0.65}$$

$$r_g = 0.9r_s \tag{B.1}$$

where

- $r_s$  is the striking distance to the conductor (m);
- $r_g$  is the striking distance to the ground (m);
- $I_O$  is the lightning-peak current (kA).

This electrogeometric model is used for the shielding-factor calculations shown in Figure 4 and for the induced-voltage flashover estimations (see B.2). The electrogeometric model may also be used to estimate the number of direct flashes to a distribution line. This is an alternate approach to the Eriksson formula given in Equation (4). This electrogeometric model gives results for direct flashes which are close to the Eriksson formula for lines heights below 15 m. For larger distribution-line heights, the difference is much greater.

#### B.2 Induced-voltage flashovers

The theoretical calculation of the number of flashovers to distribution lines produced by close lightning has been described in a comprehensive way in [B52], based on the work of Chowdhuri [B11]. This work basically considers the lightning electromagnetic fields propagating over ground of perfect conductivity, for which any field component along the distribution-line conductors is nonexistent. The basic parameters considered in [B52] are the GFD  $N_g$ , the striking distance  $r_s$ , and the source term, which, in this model, is the lightning-peak current.

Given the random nature of lightning, any calculation has to be kept within probabilistic bases and, as such, probabilistic distributions of the involved parameters have to be used. In this work we adopt CIGRE distributions for lightning-peak current [B51].

The striking distance concept, which has to be considered here in order to determine the distance from the distribution line beyond where lightning will not strike the line, is that given in Equation (B.1).

Detailed models for estimating the induced voltage have been derived [B35, B36, B1, B32, B20, B37]. Efforts have been made to formulate a complete model which takes into account soil effects on the peak amplitude and waveshape of the induced voltage.

Several induced-voltage models are available, and all are very dependent on several parameters including electrogeometric model, stroke-current model, return-stroke velocity, and current waveform characteristics. The Rusck model [B46] is chosen for induced voltages because of its simplicity, because it has shown to be mathematically correct, and because it has been shown to be somewhat consistent with experimental results. The Rusck model has been shown to be equivalent to more complicated models with some simplifying assumptions [B13, B43].

### B.2.1 Induced voltage

According to Rusck [B44], the maximum voltage that is induced in a power line in the point closest to the strike is given by:

$$V_{\max} = \frac{Z_0 I_0 h}{y} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{v}{v_0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{v}{v_0} \right)^2}} \right) \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where

- $Z_0$  is  $1/(4\pi)\sqrt{\mu_0/\epsilon_0} = 30 \Omega$ ;
- $I_0$  is the lightning-peak current;
- $h$  is the average height of the distribution line over the ground level;
- $y$  is the closest distance between the lightning strike and the line;
- $v$  is the return-stroke velocity;
- $v_0$  is the velocity of light in free space.


The value for  $Z_0$  is  $30 \Omega$ , and the generally assumed value  $v$  varies between  $0.3$  and  $1.5 \times 10^8$  m/s. For the simplified expression given in this guide, the return-stroke velocity is assumed as  $1.2 \times 10^8$  m/s.

### B.2.2 Frequency of indirect lightning flashovers

To estimate the flashover frequency, the procedures described in [B52] and in [B19] are considered. The range of the lightning-peak current 1–200 kA is divided in intervals of 1 kA, and the probability of current peak to be within that interval is calculated from Equation (3). This is found as the difference between the probability for current to be equal or larger than the lower limit and the probability for current to reach or exceed the higher limit.

The maximum distance  $y_{\max}$  for every peak current interval at which lightning may produce an insulation flashover in the distribution line is then calculated. This is obtained by solving Equation (B.2) for  $y$ , by taking  $I_0$  as the lower current limit of the interval, and taking  $V_{\max} = 1.5 \cdot \text{CFO}$ . The 1.5 factor is an approximation which accounts for the turnout in the insulation volt-time curve. This approximation is used for induced voltage, shield wire, and arrester-spacing calculations. These voltages are assumed to have much shorter duration waveshapes than the standard 1.2/50  $\mu\text{s}$  test wave.

The minimum distance  $y_{\min}$  for which lightning will not divert to the line, is calculated from Equation (5), as proposed in [B52]. For this,  $r_s$  and  $r_g$  are calculated by taking the upper limit of the current interval. This is shown graphically in Figure B.1.



**Figure B.1—Use of the electrogeometric model and the Rusck model for determining a direct stroke or induced-voltage flashover**

$$y_{\min} = \sqrt{r_s^2 - (r_g - h)^2} \tag{B.3}$$

For instance, following the described procedure, with CFO = 200 kV, for a current interval 49–50 kA,  $y_{\max}$  and  $y_{\min}$  result in 84.6 m and 72.5 m, respectively. In open ground, the three following scenarios may occur:

- a) If the stroke comes down between  $y = 0$  and  $y = y_{\min} = 72.5$  m, the stroke will hit the line.
- b) If the stroke comes down between  $y = y_{\min} = 72.5$  m and  $y = y_{\max} = 84.6$  m, the stroke will hit the ground and cause an induced-voltage flashover.
- c) Beyond  $y = y_{\max} = 84.6$  m, the stroke will hit the ground and not cause a flashover.

Finally, the number of insulation flashovers per km of distribution line and per year,  $F_p$ , is obtained as the summation of the contributions from all intervals considered, as expressed by

$$F_p = 2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{200} (y_{\max}^i - y_{\min}^i) \cdot N_g \cdot P_i \tag{B.4}$$

### B.2.3 Experimental comparison

The method described here provides a simplified way to determine the expected number of flashovers to a distribution line produced by close lightning.


Field tests and triggered-lightning tests have provided some indication of the accuracy of this model. Natural lightning recorded to a 200 m tall smoke stack, 200 m from the line, showed several measurements with very good correlation with this model (although several also had poor correlation) [B53]. Rocket triggered-lightning measurements performed at a distribution line 145 m from the lightning flash found that the measurements were 63% higher than the modeled voltages [B7]. Eriksson, et. al., showed results with good correspondence to the Rusck model [B24].

### B.2.4 Effect of shielding

The results given in Figure 5 pertain to a distribution line in open ground. This model compares favorably with experimental results discussed in B.2.3. A circuit with nearby trees or buildings will not have as many direct strokes, but there will be more of an opportunity for induced-voltage flashovers because the nearby objects will allow strokes closer to the line. The Rusck model for a distribution line shielded by nearby objects gives unrealistic estimates of distribution-line performance as shown in the top curve of Figure B.2. This model assumes that nearby objects will cause strokes to be evenly distributed at distances from the distribution line using  $y_{max}$  to determine the number of flashovers.

$$F_p = 2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{200} y_{max}^i \cdot N_g \cdot P_i \tag{B.5}$$

This model is unrealistic in that it gives far too many flashovers for circuits with large CFOs. The  $1/y$  model predicted by Rusck may break down for very close strokes. Also, most of the verification of the Rusck model has been done for lines in the open or for strokes beyond 100 m.



**Figure B.2—Induced-voltage flashovers based on the Rusck model for a circuit in open ground and for a circuit shielded by trees and/or buildings**

### B.3 Shield-wire modeling

The estimation of shield-wire performance is modeled using a similar approach adopted by the Working Group on Estimating the Lightning Performance of Overhead Lines and used in the FLASH program [B27, B28, B4]. The tighter pole spacings of distribution lines prevents accurate modeling with the existing algorithm, so some modifications are necessary for distribution lines.


Because of shorter span lengths on distribution lines, reflections from adjacent poles will greatly reduce the insulator voltage. Reflections from adjacent poles will reduce both the peak voltage and the tail of the wave-shape. For calculation of the peak voltage, only the adjacent poles need to be considered. For calculation of tail voltages, additional poles need to be considered (the FLASH model neglects towers beyond the adjacent span).

The FLASH model performs voltage calculations at 2  $\mu\text{s}$  and 6  $\mu\text{s}$ . For distribution lines, only a 2  $\mu\text{s}$  voltage will be calculated. It is assumed that reflections from adjacent poles will quickly reduce the tail, so that the 2  $\mu\text{s}$  point determines the flashover point.

Power-frequency voltages may be ignored. Although this may affect which phase(s) flash over, power-frequency effects will not change the overall flashover rate.

Pole-surge impedance and travel time do not significantly contribute to increased voltages near the front of the wave, due to smaller pole heights. Therefore, pole effects may be ignored.

The simplified model considered is shown in Figure B.3 with adjacent pole grounds modeled.  $Z_s$  is the self-surge impedance of the shield wire.



**Figure B.3—Simplified model of a direct stroke to a shield wire for distribution lines**

An expression for the voltage, including reflections from adjacent poles, is solved at  $t = 2 \mu\text{s}$  as shown in Equation (B.6). The derivation is given in appendix 12.4 of [B4] for an analogous problem. The voltage from phase-to-ground across the insulation is equal to  $V(1 - c_n)$ , where  $c_n$  is the coupling coefficient.

$$V = \frac{I_R t}{2} \left[ Z_I - \frac{Z_w(1 - \psi^N)}{1 - \psi} \right] + I_R \tau Z_w \left[ \frac{(1 - \psi^N)}{(1 - \psi)^2} - \frac{N\psi^N}{1 - \psi} \right] \quad (\text{B.6})$$

$$Z_w = \frac{2R_i^2 Z (Z - R_n)}{(Z + R_i)^2 (Z + R_n)} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

$$Z_I = \frac{R_i Z}{Z + R_i} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

$$\psi = \frac{(Z - R_i)(Z - R_n)}{(Z + R_i)(Z + R_n)} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

where

$N$  is the largest value that the wave number can reach (the largest whole number  $\leq t/2\tau$ ).

A nonlinear ground given by the following equations is used for the ground of the pole struck [B34]:

$$R_i = \frac{R_o}{\sqrt{1 + i_R/I_g}} \quad (\text{B.10})$$

$$I_g = \frac{E_g \rho}{2\pi R_o^2} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

$$i_R = I_R \frac{R_o Z}{R_o + Z} \quad (\text{B.12})$$

where

- $R_i$  is the pole footing resistance which is a function of the current through the footing resistance;
- $R_o$  is the normally measured low-current resistance;
- $E_g$  is the soil breakdown or ionization gradient, assumed at 300 kV/m [B34];
- $r$  is the soil resistivity in  $\Omega \cdot \text{m}$ ;
- $I_R$  is the peak stroke current.

Because much less current will flow through the adjacent pole grounds, the low-current resistance,  $R_o$ , is used for the adjacent pole grounds.

At 2  $\mu\text{s}$ , the volt-time insulation curve is assumed to have a turn up of 1.5 times the CFO. This is somewhat lower than the volt-time curve for insulator lengths used in the FLASH model (which is 1.68 times the CFO at 2  $\mu\text{s}$ ). This model is iterated to find a critical current used to find a probability of flashover using Equation (3). The remainder of the assumptions for shield-wire modeling are the same as the FLASH model.

For the shield-wire results shown in Figure 8,  $c_n = 0.35$ ,  $Z_s = 400 \Omega$ ,  $\rho = 1000 \Omega \cdot \text{m}$ , span length = 75 m, and  $\tau = 0.25 \mu\text{s}$ .

## B.4 Arrester spacing

### B.4.1 Direct strikes

If a direct hit strikes midspan between a pole with arresters and a pole without arresters, the voltage that may develop on the unprotected pole is determined by the separation distance between the lightning flash and the pole with arresters. This is determined by the separation distance to the next pole with arresters ( $L/2$ ), the arrester-discharge voltage level,  $V_{IR}$ , the wave velocity,  $c$ , and the rate of rise of the voltage ( $\frac{IZ_o}{2T_f}$  where  $T_f$  is the risetime).

$$V = \left( V_{IR} + \frac{L}{c} \frac{IZ_o}{2T_f} \right) \quad (\text{B.13})$$

The peak-stroke current required to cause a flashover may be found by setting  $V = 1.5 \cdot \text{CFO}$  and solving for  $I$ .

$$I_{\text{midspan}} = \frac{2cT_f(1.5 \cdot \text{CFO} - V_{IR})}{LZ_o} \quad (\text{B.14})$$

The 1.5 factor approximates the turn-up in the insulation volt-time curve.

Assuming a  $T_f = 2 \mu\text{s}$ ,  $\text{CFO} = 350 \text{ kV}$ ,  $Z_o = 10 \Omega$ ,  $L = 75 \text{ m}$ , and  $V_{IR} = 40 \text{ kV}$ , the percentage of flashovers may be calculated:

$$I_{\text{midspan}} = 19.4 \text{ kA}$$

The probability of exceeding this current, given by Equation (3), gives the probability of flashover as

$$P_{\text{midspan}} = 77.2\%$$

If a direct hit strikes a pole with phases not protected by arresters, it is assumed to flashover 100% of the time. If a direct hit strikes a pole protected by arresters, the probability of a flashover at the next pole is determined by the CFO of the unprotected pole and the ground resistance at the pole with arresters.

$$I_{\text{pole}} = \frac{1.5 \cdot \text{CFO} - V_{IR}}{R_o} \quad (\text{B.15})$$

The probability of flashover may be calculated from the critical current  $I_{\text{pole}}$  with  $V_{IR} = 40 \text{ kV}$ .

If  $R_g = 25 \Omega$  and  $\text{CFO} = 150 \text{ kV}$ , then

$$I_{\text{pole}} = 7.4 \text{ kA}, P_{\text{pole}} = 98\%$$

If  $R_g = 10 \Omega$  and  $\text{CFO} = 350 \text{ kV}$ , then

$$I_{\text{pole}} = 48.5 \text{ kA}, P_{\text{pole}} = 24\%$$

Using the probabilities of a flash-to-poles with arresters, those without arresters, and midspan between poles (assuming 50% of the time it hits midspan), it is possible to create a table of flashovers versus arrester spacing as shown in Table B.1.

**Table B.1—Direct-stroke flashovers for different spans to the next arrester**

Spans between arresters	Percent flashover $R_g = 25 \Omega$ , CFO = 150 kV	Percent flashover $R_g = 10 \Omega$ , CFO = 350 kV
1	0	0
2	100	70
3	100	80
4	100	85
Infinite	100	100

### B.4.2 Induced-voltage flashovers

Rusck’s model is assumed for voltages induced by nearby lightning. If lightning strikes the ground perpendicular to the location of a pole with arresters, it is assumed that flashovers will not occur. If lightning strikes perpendicular to the location of a pole without arresters, the voltage which develops on that pole will be determined by the separation distance to the next pole with arresters ( $L$ ), the arrester discharge level ( $V_{IR}$ ), the wave velocity ( $c$ ), and the rate of rise of the induced voltage ( $V_{pk}/T_f$ ):

$$V = V_{IR} + \frac{2LV_{pk}}{T_f c} \quad (\text{B.16})$$

The induced voltage required to cause a flashover may be found by setting  $V = 1.5 \cdot \text{CFO}$  (the 1.5 is a factor representing the turnup on the volt-time flashover curve).

$$V_{pk} = (1.5 \cdot \text{CFO} - V_{IR}) \left( \frac{T_f c}{2L} \right) \quad (\text{B.17})$$

If  $V_{pk}/1.5$  is used as an equivalent CFO, the number of flashovers per year may be estimated for that pole. This is found by looking up the number of flashovers for a CFO equal to  $V_{pk}/1.5$  on the induced-voltage flashover curve (Figure 5, un-grounded curve). For CFO = 150 kV,  $V_{IR} = 40$  kV,  $T_f = 1 \mu\text{s}$ , and  $L = 75$  m, the results are given in Table B.2.

**Table B.2—Equivalent number of induced flashovers for different spans to the next arrester**

Spans until next arrester	Voltage required to cause flashover $V_{pk}$ [kV]	Equivalent number of flashovers/100 km/yr
0	Infinite	0
1	220	0.11
2	150	1.8
3	150	1.8

By averaging the above numbers for different arrester spacings, the arrester-spacing results shown in Table B.3 are obtained. Even relatively wide arrester spacings perform fairly well (every 300 m cuts flashovers down to 28% of the value without arresters).

**Table B.3—Induced flashovers for various arrester spacings (CFO = 150 kV)**

Spans between arresters	Number of flashovers/100 km/yr GFD = 1 flash/km <sup>2</sup> /yr
1	0
2	0.06
3	0.08
4	0.51
5	0.76
6	0.94
No arresters	1.79

Using a separation distance equation for induced voltages is not correct, since it is not strictly a traveling wave. The inducing fields actually travel from the lightning stroke channel along the hypotenuse of the triangle rather than taking the corner. Voltage starts developing at the adjacent pole before an equivalent traveling wave would have gotten there. This makes the separation distance method more conservative.

## Annex C

(informative)

### Bibliography

[B1] Agrawal, A. K., Price, H. J., and Gurbaxani, S. H., "Transient Response of a Multiconductor Transmission Line Excited by a Nonuniform Electromagnetic Field," *IEEE Transactions on Electromagnetic Compatibility*, vol. EMC-22, pp. 119–129, May 1980.

[B2] AIEE Committee Report, "A Method of Estimating the Lightning Performance of Transmission Lines," *AIEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems*, vol. 69, pp. 1187–1196, 1950.

[B3] AIEE Committee Report, "Impulse Flashovers of Combinations of Line Insulators, Air Gaps, and Wood Structural Members," *AIEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems*, vol. 75, pp. 16–21, 1956.

[B4] Anderson, J. G., "Lightning Performance of Transmission Lines," *Transmission Line Reference Book, 345 kV and Above*, Electric Power Research Institute: Palo Alto, CA, 1982, ch. 12.

[B5] Anderson, R. B., Eriksson, A. J., Kroninger, H., Meal, D. V., and Smith, M. A., "Lightning and Thunderstorm Parameters," IEE Conference Publication No. 236, *Lightning and Power Systems*, London, June 1984, pp. 57–61.

[B6] Armstrong, H. R., Stoelting, H. O., and Veverka, E. F., "Impulse Studies on Distribution Line Construction," *IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems*, vol. PAS-86, no. 2, Feb. 1967.

[B7] Barker, P. P., Short, T. A., Eybert-Berard, A. R., and Berlandis, J. P., "Induced Voltage Measurements on an Experimental Distribution Line During Nearby Rocket Triggered Lightning Flashes," *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 980–995, Apr. 1996.

[B8] Bodle, D.W., Ghazi, A.J., Syed, M., and Woodside, R.L., *Characterization of the Electrical Environment, Toronto and Buffalo*, University of Toronto Press, 1976, pp. 14–15, 85–95, 124–130.

[B9] Byerley, III, L.G., Cummins, K.L., Tuel, J., Hagberg, Jr., D.J., Bush, W., "The Measurement and Use of Lightning Ground Flash Density," Intl. Aerospace & Ground Conference on Lightning and Static Electricity, Williamsburg, VA, Sept. 26–28, 1995.

[B10] Cherney, E. A., Reichman, J., Stonkus, D. J., and Gill, B. E., "Evaluation and Application of Dead-End Polymeric Insulators to Distribution," *IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems*, vol. 103, pp. 121–132, 1984.

[B11] Chowdhuri, P., "Estimation of Flashover Rates of Overhead Power Distribution Lines by Lightning Strokes to Nearby Ground," *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 1982–1989, July 1989.

[B12] Clayton, J.M., and Shankle, D. F., "Insulation Characteristics of Wood and Suspension Insulators in Series," *AIEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems*, vol. 74, pp. 1305–1312, 1955.

[B13] Cooray, V., "Calculating Lightning-Induced Overvoltages in Power Lines: A Comparison of Two Coupling Models," *IEEE Transactions on Electromagnetic Compatibility*, vol. 36, no. 3, Aug. 1994, pp. 179–182.

[B14] Darveniza H., Holcombe B. C., and Stillman, R. H., "An Improved Method for Calculating the Impulse Strength of Wood Porcelain Insulators," *IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems*, vol. 98, pp. 1909–1915, 1979.

[B15] Darveniza, M., *Electrical Properties of Wood and Line Design*, University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia, Queensland, 1980.

[B16] Darveniza, M., Limbourn, G. J., and Prentice, S. A., "Line Design and Electrical Properties of Wood," *IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems*, vol. PAS-86, no. 11, Nov. 1967.

[B17] Darveniza, M., Roby, D., and Tamma, L. R., "Laboratory and Analytical Studies of the Effects of Multipulse Lightning Current on Metal Oxide Arresters," *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 764–771, Apr. 1994.

[B18] Darveniza, M., Tumm, L.R., Richter, B., and Roby, D.A., "Multiple-Stroke Lightning and Zinc-Oxide Arresters," IEEE Paper 96 SM 398-8-PWRD.

[B19] De la Rosa, F., "Assessing the Operation of Distribution Lines in a Lightning Environment," Proceedings of the IASTED International Symposium on High Technology in the Power Industry, Bozeman, Montana, pp. 316–319, Aug. 20–22, 1986.

[B20] De la Rosa, F., "Effects of Close Lightning on Electric Power Distribution Lines," Ph.D thesis, Uppsala University, 1985.

[B21] Elrod, J. W., and Menzel, H. G., "Use of Polymer/Composite Insulators in Construction, Maintenance and Temporary Procedures," *IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems*, vol. 100, pp. 1521–1524, 1981.

[B22] EPRI Project 2542-1 Report TR-100218, "Characteristics of Lightning Surges on Distribution Lines," 1991.

[B23] Eriksson, "The Incidence of Lightning Strikes to Power Lines," *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, vol. PWRD-2, no. 2, pp. 859–870, July 1987.

[B24] Eriksson, A. J., Stringfellow, M. F., and Meal, D. V., "Lightning Induced Overvoltage on Overhead Distribution Lines," *IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems*, vol. PAS-101, no. 4, Apr. 1982.

[B25] Grzybowski, S., and Jacob, P. B., "The Steep-Front, Short-Duration Pulse Characteristics of Distribution Insulators with Wood," *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 1608–1616, 1990.

[B26] Grzybowski, S., and Jenkins, E. G., "AC and Lightning Performance of Fiberglass Crossarms Aged in 115 kV Transmission Line," *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 1914–1920, 1993.

[B27] IEEE Std 1243-1997, IEEE Design Guide for Improving the Lightning Performance of Transmission Lines.

[B28] IEEE Working Group Report: "Estimating Lightning Performance of Transmission Lines II—Updates to Analytical Models," *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 1254–1267, July 1993.

[B29] Jacob, P. B., Grzybowski, S., Libby, L., and Barsley, P. K., "Experimental Studies of Critical Flashover Voltage on Distribution Line Construction," IASTED, International Journal on Energy Systems, no. 1, pp. 30–34, 1991.

- [B30] Jacob, P. B., Grzybowski, S., and Ross, E. R., "An Estimation of Lightning Insulation Level of Overhead Distribution Lines," *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 384–390, 1991.
- [B31] MacGorman, D. R., Maier, M. W., and Rust, W. D., "Lightning Strike Density for the Contiguous United States from Thunderstorm Duration Records," Report to U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, # NUREG/CR-3759, 1984.
- [B32] Master, M. J., and Uman, M. A., "Lightning Induced Voltages on Power Lines: Theory," *IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems*, vol. PAS 103, pp. 1899–1907, Dec. 1967.
- [B33] McDermott, T. E., Short, T. A., and Anderson, J. G., "Lightning Protection of Distribution Lines," *IEEE Transactions of Power Delivery*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 138–152, Jan. 1994.
- [B34] Mousa, A. M., "The Soil Ionization Gradient Associated with Discharge of High Currents into Concentrated Electrodes," *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 1669–1677, July 1994.
- [B35] Nucci, C.A., Working Group 33.01 (Lightning), "Lightning-Induced Voltages on Overhead Power Lines, Part I: Return-Stroke Current Models with Specified Channel-Base Current for the Evaluation of the Return-Stroke Electromagnetic Fields," *Electra*, no. 161, pp. 75–102, Aug. 1995.
- [B36] Nucci, C. A., Working Group 33.01 (Lightning), "Lightning-Induced Voltages on Overhead Power Lines, Part II: Coupling Models for the Evaluation of the Induced Voltages," *Electra*, no. 162, pp. 121–145, Oct. 1995.
- [B37] Nucci, C. A., Rachidi, F., Ianoz, M., and Mazzetti, C. "Lightning Induced Voltages on Overhead Lines," *IEEE Transactions on Electromagnetic Compatibility*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 75–86, Feb. 1993, correction published in no. 4, p. 488, Nov. 1993.
- [B38] Pignini, A., et. al, "Influence of Air Density on the Impulse Strength of External Insulation," *IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems*, vol. 104, pp. 2888–2900, 1985.
- [B39] Powell, R. W., Thwaites, H. L., and Stys, R. D. "Estimating Lightning Performance of Spacer-Cable Systems," *IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems*, vol. 84, pp. 315–319, Apr. 1965.
- [B40] Ringler, K. G., Kirkby, P., Erven, C. C., Lat, M. V., and Malkiewicz, T. A., "The Energy Absorption Capability and Time-to-Failure of Varistors Used in Station-Class Metal-Oxide Surge Arresters," IEEE Paper 95 SM 364-0 PWRD.
- [B41] Ross, E. R., and Grzybowski, S., "Application of the Extended CFO-Added Method to Overhead Distribution Configurations," *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 1573–1578, 1991.
- [B42] Ross, P. M. "Burning of Wood Structures by Leakage Currents," *AIEE Transactions*, vol. 66, pp. 279–287, 1947.
- [B43] Rubinstein, M., and Uman, M. A., "Methods for Calculating the Electromagnetic Fields from a Known Source Distribution: Application to Lightning," *IEEE Transactions on Electromagnetic Compatibility*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 183–189, May 1989.
- [B44] Rusck, S., "Induced Lightning Overvoltages on Power Transmission Lines With Special Reference to the Overvoltage Protection of Low Voltage Networks," Transactions of the Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, no. 120, 1958.
- [B45] Rusck, S., *Lightning*, R. H. Golde, ed., "Protection of Distribution Lines," London: Academic Press, 1977.

[B46] Shwehdi, M. H., "Investigation and Analysis of Lightning Impulse Strengths of Multiple Dielectrics Used in Electrical Distribution Systems," Ph.D. thesis, Mississippi State University, 1985.

[B47] Shwehdi, M. H., and El-Kieb, A. A., "Lightning Critical Flashover (CFO) of Multiple Series Dielectrics Used on Distribution Systems," IASTED Proceedings, PowerHigh Tech'89, pp 653–657, July 4–7, 1989, Valencia, Spain.

[B48] Shwehdi, M. H. and El-Hadri, M. "What Polymers and Fiberglass Reinforced Plastics (FRP) May Add to Classical Primary Insulation," 1994 IEEE International Symposium on Electrical Insulation, June 5–8, 1994, Pittsburgh, PA., USA.

[B49] Shwehdi, M. H. "Advantages of Polymer and FRP Insulators Over Wood and Porcelain on Power Distribution Structures," Paper # 248-026, IASTED on High Tech'96, Banff, Canada, June 1996.

[B50] "Specifications and Drawings for 12.5/7.2-kV Line Construction," REA Bulletin 50-3, Rural Electric Association.

[B51] Working Group 01 (Lightning) of Study Committee 33 (Overvoltages and Insulation Co-ordination), "Guide to Procedures for Estimating the Lightning Performance of Transmission Lines," CIGRE Brochure #63, Oct. 1991, Paris.

[B52] Working Group Report, "Calculating the Lightning Performance of Distribution Lines," *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 1408–1417, July 1990.

[B53] Yokoyama, S. Miyake, K., Mitani, H., and Yamazaki, N., "Advanced Observations of Lightning Induced Voltage on Power Distribution Lines," *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, vol. PWRD-1, no. 2, Apr. 1986.