THE EFFECT OF A STEEL CORE UPON THE ELECTRICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF LARGE STRANDED ALUMINUM CONDUCTORS.

THESIS

 \bar{x}

CLASS OF 1916

THROOP COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY

Kenneth W Rich

THESIS

References Consulted:

Bureau of Standards Bulletins, Reprints Nos. 80, 252.

Electrical Properties of Compound Wires F. F. Fowle, Electrical World,
December 1910, January 1911.

Constant Voltage Transmission Dwight.

Electric Traction and Transmission Engineering. Sheldon & Hansman.

Electric Power Conductors. Del Mar

Magnetic Induction in Iron and Other Metals J. A. Ewing.

Pender's American Handbook for Engineers.

Standard Handbook for Electrical Engineers.

INFLUENCE OF STEEL CORE UPON THE ELECTRICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF LARGE ALUMINUM STRANDEE CONDUCTORS.

The determination of the electrical characteristics of a large aluminum stranded power cable with a steel core has been divided into the following sections in this paper:

1. A general description of the cable in question.

2. Tests for the permeability of the steel core.

3. An outline of the method followed in the tests, with the data sheets.

4. A consideration of the resistances of core and cable for direct and alternating E. M. Fs., including the skin effect.

5. *A* comparison of test results for inductances with those calculated by formulae.

6. An appendix containing matter relevant to this subject.

., .L •

The cable under test was a section of the stranded aluminum cable used by the Pacific Light & Power Corporation in transmitting power from their hydro-electric stations on Big Creek to Los Angeles two hundred and forty one miles distant. The system is three phase, fifty cycles, and is designed to transmit 60,000 kilowatts at 150,000 volts.

Fig. 1 is a photograph of an end of the cable showing the three layers of aluminum strands and the steel core in the center.

It is of interest to compare various qualities of this cable with those possessed by solid copper or solid aluminum cables.

The ratio of actual weight to that of a solid copper cable of the same size is 0.367, and to one of solid aluminum 1.22.

If spec'ific conductances be taken for copper

 10.37 , for steel 74.0 , and for aluminum 16.72, the actual conductance compared. with that of a solid copper cable is 56.48%; of a solid aluminum cable 91.11%.

The ratio of a mile ohm of this cable to that of a solid copper cable is 0.651, and to one of solid aluminum 1.34.

The wire is wound in three layers outside the core. In the outer layer there are 24 strands with one complete twist each 18 inches, the next layer has 18 strands and completes a twist in the opposite direction every 10 inches, the layer next the core is made up of 12 wires with a still greater twist, the direction being again reversed.

PERMEABILITY OF THE STEEL CORE.

To determine the permeability of the steel core the method outlined in Pender's American Handbook for Electrical Engineers, page 913, was followed, using a Leeds and Northrup Astatic Galvanometer.

For the standard solenoid mentioned in this method a portion of a permeameter, the dimensions of which were accurately known, was used.

The length of the sample in comparison to its cross section made end corrections unnecessary.

The set up is shown in Fig. 2 and the results are plotted in Fig. 3. Calculations are all given below.

$B = -4 \pi n, N_A A, I$ n A $a = A H$ A

N₁ = turns in primary of solenoid per cm. length (axial) n_{I} = total turns in secondary of solenoid. $n =$ \blacksquare \blacksquare \blacksquare \blacksquare \blacksquare \blacksquare test sample. A_{ℓ} = mean cross sectional area in cm. sq. of primary of standard if secondary be on outside, or mean cross section of secondary if secondary be on inside.

 $A =$ Cross section in cm. s q . of test sample.

 $a =$ mean cross section of magnetizing coil of test sample.

I,= current thru primary of test sample.

D = deflection when current reversed.

 $B =$ fluxdensity in test sample corresponding to deflection

D when current is magnetized coil on sample is reversed.

- $H =$ magnetizing force in sample corresponding to flux-
density B.
- Av. diam of core . 312 inches, $n_{1} = 200$; $N_{1} = 31.5$;

$$
A_{1} = 1.67
$$
 sq. cm.; $n = 36$; $A = .0764$;

$$
\frac{K}{n} = \frac{.4 \pi n \ln \ln A}{n \Delta} = \frac{.4 \times \pi \times 200 \times 31.5 \times 1.67}{36 \times .0764} = 4820
$$
const.

 $\frac{a-A}{A}$ H = $\frac{.109 - .0764}{.0764}$ H = $.0326$ H = C H for values used this term is negligible

These values were used in plotting flux density curve.

TEST PIECE

The permeability thus found is that lengthwise of the wire, whereas in the actual tests for inductance the flux is perpendicular to the length of the wire. No method for investigating the permeability crosswise appeared feasible, the high cost per foot of the cable precluded stripping the aluminum from any considerable length of the core.

OUTLINE OF METHOD USED IN RESISTANCE AND INDUCTANCE TESTS.

The following method was used in determining the alternating current resistance and inductance of both core and cable. A "fence" was built somewhat more that a foot high and in the shape of a rectangle 366.3 ft. long and of a variable width. The wire was stretched upon the boards forming the sides of the rectangle. Strong clamps of large cross section made good contact between cable and instrument connections. The photographs, Fig. 4 and Fig. 5, give a good idea of the whole set up.

All instruments used were carefully calibrated and curves were used to correct the readings obtained.

Readings were taken of volts, amperes, watts, frequency and temperature. In some runs frequency and temperature remained constant, in other cases simultaneous readings were taken of all five values.

The a. c. resistance was determined for each reading from the relation $W = I^2R$. These values were then corrected for temperature based on the resistance at 20 ° C. Temperature corrections were based on a solid aluminum conductor, the core carrying a very small proportion of the total current as appears later. The resistance per thousand feet of cable was next found and the arithmetical average

of the separate runs taken as the true resistance per thousand feet. Finally, these values were reduced to resistances for the actual lengths tested for use in calculating the inductance.

The impedance was found from the equation $E = B$ I and the average impedance based on the arithmetical average taken for the run.

The value of the reactance came from the equation $X=\sqrt{Z^2-R^2}$ and from these values knowing the fre-•
quency the inductance was easily calculated from the relation $X = 2 \pi f L$.

For watt readings the Kelvin Balance was used, a previous run with a small wattmeter and current transformer proving unsatisfactory. The Balance was checked with direct current and found accurate.

The system of averaging resistances and impedances was used only after complete calculations from the separate readings were worked out and this method shown to be accurate.

The direct current resistances were taken with laboratory standard instruments and a storage battery.

The data sheets follow.

STEEL CORE, 15 Foot Spacing

Length of Side 22.75', Total Length 86.5' of Cable

D. C. Measurements

 $\ell = \frac{1}{2}$

Average d. c. resistance .1158 ohms for the length tested, or 1.339 ohms per 1000 ft.

A. C. Measurements

Average impedance .1254 ohms. Average a. c. resistance .1175 ohms, at 20[°] Cent. per 1000 ft. 1.360 ohms.

 $Z^2 = R^2$ = .00192

 $X = .0438$

L = 138.6 millihenrys

RESISTANCE OF CABLE TO DIRECT CURRENT

Temperature 28.5° C. Average resistance at 20° C. of 750.5 ft. of cable is .02077 ohms. Resistance per 1000 ft. is .02767 ohms.
Resistance per mile, 0.1461 ohms at 20 0.
Weight is 592.9 pounds per mile-ohm. If aluminum only, d. c. resistance would be .0281 ohms per 1000 ft.

CABLE 9 ft. SPACING

Average a. c. resistance at 20° α .0235
Corrected for length tested .0237 ohms.
Resistance per 1000 ft. at 20° C. .03139
Frequency 50.25 cycles constant. .03131

Average impedance = .0787

$$
Z^2 - X^2 \t .005632
$$

\n
$$
X^2 = .0750
$$

\n
$$
L = 237.6 \t millihenrys inductance
$$

CABLE 11.8 ft. SPACING

 $\label{eq:3.1} y$

Average a. c. resistance = .0234 ohms at 20° C.
Average a. c. resistance per 1000 ft. at 20° C.=.03093
Corrected value for length tested = .02389.
Frequency 51 cycles constant.

CABLE 15 foot SPACING

Average a. c. resistance at 20° C. = .02421 ohms
Average a. c. resistance per 1000 ft. = .03173 ohms
Corrected value for length tested = .02409 ohms
Average impedance = .09341
Frequency 50.9 cycles, Temperature 71.5°

$$
Z^2 - R^2 = .008146
$$

X = .09022
T₁ = 282.1 millihenrvs inductance

CABLE. 18 foot SPACING

Volts Amps. Current Squared Volts Corr. Watts Corr. Amperes 7.67 8.23 85.0 83.4 6956 13.4 8.20 16.7 8.91 92.5 90.9 82622 9.15 10.27 106.0 104.6 21.9 10940 9.28 10.46 108.0 106.7 11370 22.8 11.26 9.80 116.0 114.0 13000 26.6 11.25 11.33 119.0 116.7 27.6 13620 11.85 11.925 123.6 126.0 15270 31.0 12.60 12.96 135.0 132.3 17500 35.3 11.25 11.33 119.5 116.1 13480 27.6 13.10 13.45 141.0 138. 19040 38.4 Watts Resist-Temp. Rest. Impedance Corr. Corr. Corr. ance $.02408$.02323 .09868 167.5 $.00085$.09802 $.02440$ 208.7 $.02526$ $.00086$ 273.8 .09690 $.02503$ $.00085$ $.02418$ 285.0 $.02506$ $.00085$ $.02421$.09804 $.02470$.09868 332.5 $.02557$ $.00087$ 345.0 $.02447$.09708 $.02533$ $.00086$ 387.5 $.02538$ $.00086$ $.02452$ $.09648$ 441.3 $.02456$.09797 $.02522$ $.00086$ 345.0 $.02559$ $.00086$ $.02473$ $.09844$ $.02436$ $.09746$ $.02522$ $.00086$ 480.0

Average a. c. resistance at 20[°] C. = .02439 ohms. $\frac{1000 \text{ ft}}{\text{m}} = \frac{1000 \text{ ft}}{\text{m}} = \frac{1000 \text{ ft}}{\text{m}} = 0.03171$
Corrected value for length fested = .02428 ohms. Frequency 50.8 cycles, Temp. 82º Constants. Average impedance = .09777 ohms.

> $Z^2 - R^2 = .008969$ $X = .0947$ $L = 296.7$ millihenrys inductance.

CABLE, 20 foot SPACING

Average a. c. resistance = .02499 ohms.
 $\frac{1}{1!}$ n n n m = per 1000 ft.= .0322 ohms. Corrected value for length tested = 02441 ohms.
Frequency 50.8 cycles, Temp. 91° constants. Average impedance $= .09945$ ohms.

$$
Z^{2} - R^{2} = .009294
$$

X = .09638
L = 302 millihenrys inductance

RESISTANCES

The resistances to alternating currents for both core and cable are plotted in Fig. 6 and Fig. 7 and the averages indicated.

The increase in cable resistance to alternating currents over that to direct currents is 14.9 %.

Kennelly in a paper entitled "Experimental Researches on Skin Effect in Conductors" published in the Proceedings of the American Institute, August 1915, makes the following remarks.

Current distortion is due to three classes of effects:

1. Skin effect proper.

2. "Spirality" effect in stranded conductors.

3. "Proximity" effect due to the spacing of the return conductor.

The "spirality" effect adds somewhat to the skin effect in the case of stranded conductors. The "proximity" effect is imperceptible for frequencies under 100 and spacings above 20 cms.

Pender's American Handbook makes the following statement: "Change in resistance due to skin effect is always relatively much higher than the change in inductance.

The following theoretical formula for skin

effect was taken from the Standard Handbook.

$$
r = R \left\{ 1 + \frac{1}{12} \left(\frac{2 \pi f \cdot 1 \cdot \mu}{R \times 10^{9}} \right) - \frac{1}{180} \left(\frac{2 \pi f \cdot 1 \cdot \mu}{R \times 10^{9}} \right) + \cdots - \text{etc.}
$$

where, $r = a$. c. resistance

 $R = d$. c. resistance

 $1 =$ length in cms.

f = frequency in cycles per. sec.

 $p =$ permeability

using this equation to solve for the permeability of the core, μ = 58 for a current value of around 43 amperes flowing in the core.

Solving the same equation for the cable gives a value of 3. 8 as an equivalent permeability for the whole cable.

Penders American Handbook gives the following equations for calculating skin effect.

 $\bar{x} = .02768 \sqrt{\frac{\mu_{\text{f}}}{R}}$ where **y,** f and R have the same significance as above and x is a number which determines values for K_1 and K_2 , constants for skin effect conditions. K_f and K_2 are listed in a table.

Solving for skin effect in core, the alternating current resistance to be expected would be 1.0144×1.539 or 1.360 ohms per 1000 ft., a value which is identical with the test result.

Using the same equation for the cable the solution gives . 0312 ohms a. c. resistance per 1000 ft. of cable, thus checking closely the value .0316 the test average.

Pender's American Handbook also gives the following equation for calculating the added effect of inductance caused by skin effect.

 $L' = L + .0152$ $\{ \mu k_2 - 1 \}, L'$ and L being total inductance and inductance minus skin effect respectively, and *p* and *K*, having the same significance as stated above.

The second term on the right then is the added inductance due to skin effect. This term is so small as to be nearly negligible in these tests having a value of about .04 millihenrys per 1000 feet.

The percentages of current carried by core and aluminum may be approximated by considering them as two circuits in parallel and solving by means of comparing admittances. Since the resistances and reactances are known the conductances and susceptances are easily found, and hence the admittances. This method gives for the admittance of the core 0.688 ohms and for the aluminum 7.84 ohms. The core should then carry 8.78% of the current and the aluminum 91.22%

The ratio of core a. c. resistance to cable a. c. resistance is 43.1 : 1.

If copper took the place of aluminum, based on

 61% conductivity of aluminum the cable resistance would be .. 0193 ohms per 1000 feet and the ratio of core resistance to cable resistance in that case would be 70.54 : 1.

INDUCTANCE.

The test results of inductances are shown in Fig. 8. For comparative purposes the inductance was also calculated by formulae.

The first formula used was that of E. B. Rosa, of the Bureau of Standards, and is for solid conductors. The formula is given below.

> $L = 4$ $\left($ (a+b) log $\frac{2ab}{2}$ F \div a log (a+d) $-$ b log (b+d) $\frac{7}{4}$ (a+b) + 2(d+p)}. L = inductance in centimeters. $a =$ length in centimeters. b:width or spacing in centimeters P = radius of wire in centimeters $= 1.205$. $d = \sqrt{a^2 + b^2}$.

H. B. Dwight on page 115 of the appendix to his book entitled "Constant Voltage Transmission" gives the following formula calculated for a 61 strand one metal conductor.

> $L = 741.13 \tlog_{10} \frac{2.590 \times S}{d} \times$ S = spacing in inches d = actual diameter of cable $L =$ inductance in henrys per mile

The inductance is that for the number of feet of cable in the rectangle, the formula being developed for a line of infinite length.

It will be seen in Fig. 8 that the test result coincides exactly with the inductance calculated by the Bureau of Standards formula at the 20 foot spacing only.

Fig. 9 shows the percent differences between formulae and test results at different spacings .

As a result of these tests it is recommended that the value of the a. c. resistance used in calculations of the Big Creek Cable be that of the d. c. resistance increased 14.9 $\%$, and that the reactance values be those found by the standard methods.

APPENDIX

When preliminary work was under way, and before any results were obtained it was believed the inductance would plainly show an upward slope as the current increased due to the flux in the iron core. At this time the discussion led to the development of a formula whereby the permeability could be calculated, knowing the inductance, currents in core and aluminum and the physical dimensions. Credit is chiefly due to Mr. J. W. DuMond of the Class of 1916 for developing this formula which is hereby given as possibly being of value in the future.

Let ϕ_i = flux due to current in iron
 ϕ_n = "" " " " aluminum $\phi_j = \frac{1}{2} i, \mu + 2i, x \log \frac{d-r}{r}$; d is the spacing of cable
i, is the current in the core i₂ is the current in the aluminum r_1 is the radius of the core
 r_2 is the radius of the cable µ is the permeability
1 is the length

 φ_2 is the same as flux if the tube were solid, minus the flux due to aluminum core.

 $\varphi_2 = \frac{1}{2} i_2 \frac{r_2^2}{r^2 - r^2} - \frac{1}{2} i_2 \frac{r_1^2}{r^2 - r^2} + 2i_2 \log \frac{d-r_2}{r_2}$ $\oint = \frac{1}{2} i_1 + 2i_2 \log \frac{d-r_2}{r} + \frac{1}{2} i_1 \mu + 2 i_1 \log \frac{d-r_1}{r}$ = $i_2(\frac{1}{2}+2 \log \frac{d-r_2}{r_2})+2 i_1 \log \frac{d-r_1}{r_1}+ \frac{1}{2} i_1 \mu$ $\mu = a \phi_i + b$; but $\frac{1}{2} i$, $\mu = \phi_i = \frac{1}{2} i$, $(a\phi_i + b)$ solving for $\phi_i = \frac{1}{2} \frac{i}{1} \frac{b}{1}$ Let $K_1 = 2 \log \left(\frac{d-r_1}{r_1} \right);$ $K_2 = \left(\frac{1}{2} + 2 \log \frac{d-r_2}{r_2} \right)$
 $K_1' = 2 \log \frac{1-r_1}{r_1};$ $K_2' = \left(\frac{1}{2} + 2 \log \frac{1-r_2}{r_1} \right)$ $\varphi = K_2 i_2 + K_1 i_1 + \frac{r_1}{2} i_1 b$. Let $i_2 = n i_1$ and the total
current $I = i_1 + i_2$ then $i_1 = \frac{I}{n+1}$ and $i_2 = \frac{n}{n+1}$ $\emptyset = \frac{n}{n+1} K_z I \frac{1}{n+1} K_t I + \frac{I b}{2n+2 - I a} j I is total current.$ $L_{\text{total}} = 2 \frac{1}{n+1} \left(\frac{n}{n+1} - K_{2} t_{n+1} \right) - K_{1} t_{2} \frac{b}{n+2-1 a}$ + 2 d $\left(\frac{n}{n+1} - \frac{n'}{2} + \frac{1}{n+1} - \frac{n'}{2} + \frac{b}{n+2-1} \right)$