

unit

BY VYTENIS BABRAUSKAS, PH.D., ISSAQUAH, WASHINGTON—A sizable fraction of ignitions of structures are due to electrical faults associated with wiring or with wiring devices. Surprisingly, the modes in which electrical faults progress to ignitions of structure have not been extensively studied. This paper reviews the known, published information on this topic and then points out areas where further research is needed. The focus is solely on single-phase, 120/240V distribution systems. It is concluded that systematic research has been inordinately scarce on this topic, and that much of the research that does exists is only available in Japanese.

Background

The latest statistics of the National Fire Protection Association¹, available for 1993–1997 are that 41,200 home structure fires per year are attributed to "electrical distribution." These electrical distribution fires account for 336 civilian deaths, 1446 civilian injuries, and \$643.9 million in direct property damage per year. These figures include a proportional distribution of fires with unknown equipment involved in ignition, but do not include power cords or plugs which are attrib-

uted to specific appliances. The 41,200 structure fires account for 9.7% of total home structure fires in the period, placing electrical distribution 5th out of 12 major causes. The \$643.9 million in property damage represents 14.4% of total damage, putting electrical distribution in second place (behind incendiary or suspicious causes). Earlier statistics compiled for 1985–1994 by FEMA² showed very similar results: electrical distribution was the fifth-ranked cause of fires, the fourth-ranked cause of fire fatalities, and the second-ranked cause of property loss. The electrical distribution¹ causes are itemized in Table 1.

The high losses sustained due to electrical distribution fires do not imply that the systems are unreliable.



There are about 270 million people in the US, occupying about 100 million housing units, with the average housing TABLE 1 Causes of U.S. residential fires due to electrical distribution

| CAUSE OF FIRE | PERCENT |
|--|---------|
| Fixed wiring | 34.7 |
| Cords and plugs | 17.2 |
| Light fixtures | 12.4 |
| Switches, receptacles & outlets | 11.4 |
| Lamps & light bulbs | 8.3 |
| Fuses, circuit breakers | 5.6 |
| Meters & meter boxes | 2.2 |
| Transformers | 1.0 |
| Unclassified or unknown electrical distribution equipment | 7.3 |

having 5.4 rooms³. This

means there are 2.7 persons per housing unit, or 2 rooms per person. If there are 4 outlets per room, then the number of receptacles is $4x2x270x10^{6} = 2.16$ billion. A certain percentage should be subtracted for receptacles not in use. It may be estimated that half the receptacles have a device plugged in. Of the remaining half, it will be assumed that half are "daisy-chained" to another outlet, and that the other outlet is in use. Thus, the actual number of receptacles carrying current is estimated as 3/4 of 2.16 billion, or 1.62 billion. NFPA statistics indicate that 4700 fires originate at "switches, receptacles and outlets," but CPSC⁴ further breaks down the statistics for switches, indicating that these account for 30% of the above figure. Subtracting out the switch fires, 3290 fires per year are due to receptacles/outlets. The failure rate is then estimated as 3290/1.62x10°, or 2x10°/yr. The very low failure rate indicates that electrical receptacles are highly reliable. The problem lies not with a high probability of failure, per device, per annum. Instead, the issue is that electrical distribution involves an extraordinarily high number of devices distributed throughout the

built environment. Each one supplies energy, and each one can potentially fail and cause a fire.

Modes of ignition

Given that the electrical distribution ranks second in the dollar loss due to fires, one might conclude that there has been a large body of work examining the failure mechanisms that lead to ignition of fires. This proves not to be correct, and, in fact, the research has been fragmentary at best. The examination of failures can be approached in several different ways:

a. Identifying the act(s) or omission(s) leading to failure

b. Classifying failures by the functional nature of the device or part thereof that failed

c. Studying the basic physics of failures.

Both *a* and *b* are essential in reconstruction of accidents, but the focus of this paper will be on *c*. This is especially important since several authors^{5.6} have already reported studies along the lines of *a* or *b*.

A consideration of the failure mechanisms reveals that there are only a few main ways that electrical insulation, or combustibles close by to electric distribution components, can be ignited, although there are diverse aspects to each:

- 1. Arcing
- 2. Excessive ohmic heating, without arcing
- 3. External heating.

Some ignition types involve a combination of mechanisms, so they must not be viewed as mutually- exclusive causes of fire.

Arcing

Topologically, an arc can be either a series arc or a parallel arc. Some authors consider a third form of arc—line-to-ground—is possible when the circuit contains a ground in addition to a neutral. But the topological arrangement is identical to that of the parallel arc, since the load is not in series with the arc. The distinction between the two basic forms of arcs is essential. In the case of the series arc, the occurrence of the arc *decreases* the current flow in the circuit. Thus, an over-current protection device cannot be expected to respond.

The causes of arcs can be many, but the primary ones are:

- 1. Carbonization of insulation (arc tracking)
- 2. Externally induced ionization of air (created by flames or
- an earlier arc)
- 3. Short circuits

Carbonization of Insulation

In 120 VAC circuits, it is not difficult to cause sustained arcing if there is a carbonized conductive path. This is sometimes called 'arcing-across-char.' The mechanism has been known in electrical engineering for a very long time⁷. How a carbonized path gets established across an insulating material is not a trivial question. There turn out to be more than one way of creating such a path. The simplest way, used in some standard test methods⁸, is to create an arc directly at the surface of the insulation, for example,



by placing two electrodes on the insulator and applying a high voltage across them. Another mechanism involves the combined effects of moisture and pollutants on the surface. This process is sometimes called 'wet tracking' and has been a particular problem for aircraft wiring with aromatic polyimide insulation⁹. The combined effects of surface moisture and pollutants cause leakage currents across the surface of the insulator, which, in time, can lead to formation of carbonized tracks¹⁰.

Insulating materials vary widely in their susceptibility to arc tracking. A large fraction of wiring in 120/240V circuits is insulated with PVC, but unfortunately PVC is one of the less-satisfactory polymers with regards to arc tracking¹⁰. Noto and Kawamura¹¹ have reported on extensive wet-tracking experiments with PVC-insulated cables. Using the standard IEC 60112 test method¹², they documented a number of specimen types that led to flaming ignition of the cable.

When PVC is exposed to temperatures of 200–300°C, it chars and the char is a semiconductor. Not surprisingly, this can lead to leakage currents and arcing. But Nagata and Yokoi¹³ found that if virgin PVC was heated to the rather low temperature of 160°C, impressing 100V across 1 mm of insulator thickness was sufficient to cause ignition of the insulation. Furthermore, if the insulation had previously been preheated to 200–300°C, then ignitions occurred when the preheated insulation was raised to only very mild temperatures during the voltage test—from room temperature to 40°C—were found sufficient (Figure 3).



Hagimoto et al.¹⁴ conducted laboratory studies on arcing faults (parallel arcing) of electrical cords. They identified that the process typically proceeds in a repetitive, but irregular fashion. They identified the following sequence of steps:

- Initial current flow occurs due a carbonized layer.
- The current flow increases and results in local arcing.
- The arcing causes melting of metal and expulsion of the molten pieces.
- Once the molten pieces are expelled, current flow drops.
- Continued current flow through carbonized material eventually leads again to a sizeable current flow.

The process repeats indefinitely. The authors also measured the

April 2002 – FIRE CARSON INVESTIGATOR

current waveforms during the process, and found peaks up to 250A, but these peaks were rare, and the waveform typically showed peaks no greater than 50A. Consequently, a long time would take before a circuit breaker would be expected to open. (Note, of course, that the actual current values will depend on the resistance of the particular circuit tested).

Externally-induced Ionization of Air

The intrinsic dielectric strength of air is high (roughly 3 MV m⁻¹, for all except very small gaps), but breakdown can occur at much lower values if the air space is ionized by some means. Two such means are flames and pre-existing arcs. If a serious arc-fault occurs in a distribution bus, a large amount of ionized gases will be ejected. These can travel a certain distance, and if they encounter another circuit, they can readily cause a breakdown and new arcing at the second location¹⁵. The decreased breakdown strength of air due to presence of flames has been documented in laboratory studies by Mesina¹⁶, who showed that the dielectric strength of air drops to ca. 0.11 MV m⁻¹ in flames. Mesina's study, however, only encompassed conditions at 1600V and higher.

Fire-induced arcing is considered that the most common situation for arcing damage to be encountered in fire scenes¹⁷. It can involve either carbonization of insulation, externally-induced ionization of air, or both, but there does not exist a study examining either phenomenon in the case of fires involving 120V branch circuits.

Short Circuits

The term "short circuit" is commonly applied in the situation where a low-resistance, high-current fault suddenly develops in a circuit. This can take two forms:

- 1. A bolted short where a good metal-to-metal contact is made across a full-thickness section of metal;
- 2. An arcing short, where initial metal-to-metal contact is not sustained and current flows through an arc.

In a bolted short, heating is not localized at the fault but distributed over the entire length of the circuit. A bolted short can readily be created by mis-wiring a circuit and then turning on the circuit breaker. The circuit breaker then typically trips before anything ignites. It is, in fact, exceedingly hard to create a fire in branch-circuit wiring from a bolted short^{18,19}.

An arcing short results from a momentary contact of two conductors. This causes melting of the material around the contact area. Magnetic forces tend to push the conductors apart, and the liquid bridge between them then gets broken. Sparking may be observed as the conductors come apart. After an arcing short, large-diameter conductors can often be seen with a notch on the surface; smaller-diameter wires may be severed entirely; both results are illustrated in NFPA 921²⁰.

It is also hard to ignite combustibles from arcing shorts in normal branch circuits protected by 20A or smaller circuit breakers or fuses. For example, Béland¹⁷ hammered cables, armored cables, and conduits until the circuit breaker opened; these produced minimal mechanical sparks and could never ignite wood, although in some cases loose fibers from wood fiberboard insulation did ignite. On the other hand, Kinoshita et al.²¹ successfully ignited cotton gauze when creating bolted shorts with wires having 1.6mm diameter solid conductors and also with ones using 1.25mm² stranded conductors. In their experiments, this required a thermal-mode-only, 20A circuit breaker; when using a 20A thermal/magnetic breaker, ignitions were not observed.

A bit of experimental ingenuity reveals that there are modes of parallel arcing caused by short circuits that have a high probability for ignition. Franklin²² described that fires were readily started in blankets and in paper, when a power cord was cut with diagonal cutters. The fires ignited from the molten copper droplets which are ejected. In such a situation, a bolted-short condition persists only very briefly, since the magnetic forces induced by the short circuit push the conductors apart, converting the bolted short into an arc. He was able to create up to thirty such short circuits on a power cord before a 20A circuit breaker tripped. Nishida²³ found that cotton and paper (but not PVC) could be ignited when a single 0.18mm strand contacted a strand from the other leg of a stranded cable. But he concluded that ignition was occurring due to the high temperature reached by the strand and not through arc energy.

The cutting of an energized electrical cord by an electric saw can result in ignition of nearby combustibles having a low thermal inertia. UL has a "guillotine" test which simulates a sawing accident²⁴. Cheese-cloth is placed nearby as the ignition target.

Excessive Ohmic Heating

The causes of excessive ohmic heating can be subdivided into:

- 1. Gross overloads
- 2. Excessive thermal insulation
- 3. Stray currents and ground faults
- 4. Overvoltage
- 5. Poor connections

Gross Overloads

It is easy to start fires by creating a gross overload in an electric cable. But the circumstances required for it do not tend to correspond to ways by which electric wiring fires normally start. The smallest power cords or extension cords in general use in the U.S. are 18AWG, and these are rated for 10A. Experimental studies on the gross-overload ignition mode are meager, but they indicate that currents 3–7 times the rated load are needed for ignition^{25, 26, 27}. Since branch circuits are normally protected by 15 or 20A circuit breakers or fuses, a gross overload must be considered a rare cause of fires in branch-circuit wiring.

Excessive Thermal Insulation

There are simple ways in which a fire can be created with an electric cord that is neither damaged nor subjected to a current in excess of its rated capacity—loop it up upon itself several times, or provide a high amount of external insulation, or both. Laboratory demonstrations have verified that ignition readily occurs²⁸; in one case, simply coiling the cord three times and covering with a cloth sufficed²⁹. A special form of this hazard occurs with the old knob-and-tube wiring, which was common in the U.S. prior to World War II. This type of wiring uses two separate conductors which are not grouped into a cable, but are individually strung on widely-spaced porcelain knobs. The current-carrying capacity is dependent on there being unobstructed air cooling of the wires, and fires have occurred when the wires were buried in thermal insulation⁶.

Stray Currents and Ground Faults

Stray currents occur when circumstances cause current to flow through paths not intended to carry current. Ground faults are a well-known example^{30,31}. They can occur if a conductor is abraded or damaged and contacts metal siding, roofing, etc. Kinoshita et al.³² documented that only 5A was required for ignition when a 3-conductor, PVC-insulated cable contacted a galvanized iron roof. An unusual mode of ignition from a ground fault is where current flows through a gas line. The current causes overheating of the metal and eventually a failure occurs³³. In cold climates, it is not rare for individuals to thaw a frozen water pipe by attaching a welding transformer and passing

April 2002 – FIRECARSON INVESTIGATOR

current through it. Fires have resulted due the very large currents that are involved³⁴. Sanderson³⁵ studied a case where thawing activity did not ignite the house that was being worked on, but caused ignition in six neighboring houses fed from the same power utility connection.

Overvoltage

All indications are that this is a rare form of ignition, as concerns branch-circuit wiring. The materials used for wires and wiring devices are well able to withstand the normal surges that are a regular event in a power distribution system. To experience ignitions, one of three events are generally needed:

- a. Lightning strike
- b. Accidental delivery of high voltage into low voltage wiring
- c. Floating neutral



Lightning strikes can result in massive ignitions, not just of wiring, but of all sorts of combustibles. The problem has generally not been studied in connection with 120/240V wiring systems. Occasional fire reports are encountered where, due to some malfunction in the power distribution network, high voltage got applied to wiring intended to carry only 120/240V. These cases are rare enough that no systematic study exists. Floating neutral problems are a bit less rare, but again, no systematic studies exist. The basic problem is illustrated in Figure 4. A normal load, such as R_x , expects to see 120V presented to it. But if a break in the neutral occurs, it will be presented with a voltage that can range from slightly above 0, up to almost 240V; the exact value is determined by the other loads on the system, R_1 and R_2 . Ignitions are not surprising in such circumstances.

Poor connections

If a connection is not mechanically tight and of low resistance, it can start to undergo a progressive failure. The process often has the quality of an unstable, positive-feedback loop. High resistance creates localized heating, heating increases oxidation and creep, the connection becomes less tight, and further heating occurs, until high temperatures are attained. At a certain stage, a poor connection can become a glowing connection which shows very high temperatures. At that point, nearby combustibles may be subject to ignition. The process generally appears to be one of ohmic heating albeit with a highly complex resistive element (but as indicted below, there is some possibility that arcing also plays a role in glowing connections).

One of the earliest efforts to study glowing connections dates to 1961³⁶. The primary results are shown in the two figures to the right. The connection acts as a non-linear circuit element. For currents over 10A, drops of around 20V were found. But for small currents, voltage drops in the tens of volts can be found. At a maximum current of 2A, ca. 50W is dissipated in a copper/brass connection and around 35W for copper/iron. The study noted that the power dissipation depends only on the materials involved and not on the nominal size of the contacts. It was also found that to start the glowing process, a current of 4–6A had to be supplied; glowing of freshly-made connections could not be started with smaller currents.

Subsequently, a number of research projects delved into further details of glowing connections, especially following the popularization of aluminum wiring in residential and mobile home construction in the 1970s. Hotta³⁷ identified a number of fire cases attributable to this cause and conducted studies where he found that approximately 15W was dissipated in a glowing copper-copper connection drawing 1A, and about 25W at 2.5A. By means of X-ray analysis, Hotta identified that the high resistance in a copper-copper connection is due to

81.59

progressive formation of Cu₂O at the junction. Kawase³⁸ further studied the glowing process with copper-copper connections. Using an AC source of less than 100V and 0.5 to 1.0A currents, he noted the following sequence of events when an intermittent copper-to-copper connection is made. Initially, when the contact is made and broken, blue sparks are generated. After a num-





POWER DISSIPATION ACROSS GLOWING CONNECTIONS OF TWO TYPES

ber of make/break cycles, the sparks become red, instead of blue. If after this time, contact is made continuously, a "Cu₂O breeding process" begins to take place. Layers of Cu₂O begin to grow on both contacts. Along the layer of Cu₂O, a single bright filament emerges. Molten metal is located along this thin filament, which meanders "like a worm." Kawase measured the voltage-current relationship of the glowing connection and found that it cycles between high- and low-conductivity states. He interpreted the cycling as a recurring breakdown of the interface between Cu and Cu₂O. Hagimoto et al.³⁹ found that in AC circuits, for 1mm wires, the minimum current necessary for glow to be sustained was 0.3—2A, while for 2mm wires, it was 1—2.5A.

Sletbak et al.⁴⁰ studied additional details of the Cu₂O breeding process and found that the filament glows at 1200–1300°C. The process is able to sustain itself, since copper continues to be oxidized underneath. The high temperatures attained can readily lead to ignition. With a current of 1 A, values of 200–350°C were recorded at a 10mm distance from the glowing point. If a temperature of ca. 1250°C is taken to be as typical for the hot part of a glowing Cu-Cu connection, it can be noted that it is very close to 1230°C, the melting point of Cu₂O. Hagimoto et al. [] explain that the pulsing waveform found for glowing connections is accounted for by spatter (mechanical sparks) that is emitted from the connection. The spatter ejects material and this causes a momentary fluctuation in current.

Meese and Beausoleil⁴¹ conducted a series of experiments specifically focusing on glowing at the screw terminals of an AC duplex outlet. Glowing connections readily occurred when the screw was not tightly tightened. Visible glow occurred for currents carrying as little as 0.3A in a 120V circuit and also in low-voltage (3-4V) circuits carrying less than 1A. In low voltage applications, glowing connections could be established in circuits with a voltage of less than 10V. A poor connection which is glowing can re-establish the glow if the current is cut off and later turned back on. There does not appear to be any time limit for glows; in one experiment Meese and Beausoleil saw a connection glow for 129h. In a circuit carrying 20A, a glowing connection was seen to dissipate 20-40W; this is contrasted with 0.08-0.2W for a good connection at 20A. A glowing connection in a typical residential duplex outlet may be dropping only about 1-2V across it-this is why the problem may not be noticed at an early stage. Meese and Beausoleil also found that steel screws are much more likely than brass screws to produce a glowing connection.

An interesting question is whether some pairs of metals might be immune to glowing. Several research groups have made claims that a particular pairing cannot lead to glow. But a different research group typically succeed in eliciting a glowing connection with the selfsame pairing of metals. At the moment, there does not appear to be any confirmed non-glowing pairs of contact metals.

Complicating matters somewhat, UL^{24} has proposed, on the basis of unpublished experimental work, that a phenomenon identified as "micro arcing" is involved in a glowing connection. When two metals are separated by a metal-oxide layer, conduction is essentially nil across the layer, which is a dielectric. But the applied voltage can cause a breakdown of the oxide layer. This discharge can cause a fine metal bridge to be created across the dielectric. Substantive current will flow through the metal bridge, but because of its limited current carrying capacity, it shortly overheats, melts, and breaks apart. The process then continues, but because of the high temperatures being created locally, oxide layers are further built up. Other researchers have not attempted to prove or disprove this UL hypothesis.

IEC⁴² and Sandia National Laboratories⁴³ both developed different test methods intended to simulate a glowing connection as a means of testing the ignitability of electric wires and cables from this source, but neither method has been validated for ignition of building components. CPSC has found that, in a flagrant violation of both regulations and good sense, a number of fires which were caused by amateurs who made connections to building wires by simply twisting two wires together, and neither soldering nor using a wire nut on the connection⁶. Similarly, individuals sometimes repair electric cords simply by twisting the wires together and insulating them with electrical tape. This leads to a poor connection, and Hijikata and Ogawara⁴⁴ measured the characteristics of some joints of this type at currents of 10– 20A. They found that the temperature of the joint increased linearly with current, typically being 50–95°C for 10A, and going up to 130– 300°C at 20A.

Long-term failures of twist-on connectors was studied by Béland⁴⁵. When two copper wires were joined by a twist-on connector without adequate tightening, he found that failures commonly occur due to metal loss, but his always occurred "several inches" away from the connector, not at the connector itself. This was discovered to be a corrosion problem. Overheating of the connector liberates HCl gas from the PVC wire; the gas is corrosive and attacks copper. Over long periods, metal loss occurs to the point that a connection can be completely severed.

Ignitions from Poor Connections

A glowing connection might typically be found in a wall cavity, where the closest combustibles—thermosetting plastics used as case materials for outlets or switches, along with wood studs—are high-thermal-inertia substances unlikely to be easily ignited. Thus, the question arises as to what exactly a glowing connection in one of these electrical devices can ignite. On this crucial question, only three very limited, unpublished studies can be found. Aronstein⁴⁶ states that he successfully ignited:

- Low thermal inertia furnishings (bedding, drapes, upholstery) placed directly against the face of an outlet, from a connection dissipating 28W.
- Thermosetting-plastic receptacle cover plates, from a connection dissipating 30W (thermoplastic cover plates, however, were prone to melt away rather than to ignite).
- Wood studs, from a connection dissipating 35–50W.

Unfortunately, Aronstein gave few details of his experimental work. He did note that the burning of the thermosetting cover plates was a flameless, glowing combustion, and that a lightweight material (e.g., drapes) would have to be contacting the cover plate for further propagation to take place. In the case of ignitions of studs, again he found that initial ignition was of a glowing type or smoldering type, but that this turned into flaming when it broke to the other side of the stud, or, in the case of wood paneling, when it broke through the front face of the paneling. Aronstein also reports that glowing connections were able to ignite:

- Male plugs, cords, and small transformers plugged into the outlet.
- Vapor barriers inside the wall cavity.

But he gave no details about the conditions needed for these ignitions to occur. He also found that a connection glowing at a 45–50W level was able to melt aluminum wiring, and the gobs of molten aluminum could ignite a cardboard box filled with papers.

Ontario Hydro⁴⁷ conducted a series of tests using duplex outlets wired with aluminum wire and previously exposed to a modest overload of 27A. The outlets were cycled using a 15A load applied for 3.5h, then off for 0.5h. A mockup up stud space was built, including thermal insulation inside the cavity and combustibles placed at the face. No male plug was used, the current being drawn by a daisy-chain connection. The results are summarized in Table 2.

| TABLE 2 |
|--|
| Results from Ontario Hydro testing of duplex outlets with poor connections |

| WALL PANELING | INSULATION | COVERING OVER OUTLET PLATE | WIRING METHOD | RESULTS |
|------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|
| Wood | Cellulose | Cotton blanket | Screw | Scorching only |
| Wood | Cellulose | Cotton blanket | Back-wired | Wood paneling & cellulose insulation ignited after 4 cycles |
| Wood | Cellulose | Cotton blanket | Back-wired | Fuse blew in 4th cycle; paneling & insulation ignited after current flow ceased |
| Gypsum wallboard | Fiber glass | Cotton drapery | Back-wired | No ignition after 42 cycles; plastic outlet parts charred |

Hagimoto⁴⁸ reports one unpublished experiment where a glowing connection was made in a knife switch. The switch was housed in a molded plastic case and attached to a wood board. After about 5h of carrying 10A, the wood had partly carbonized and a piece of plastic from the case melted, dropped onto the hot conductor, and ignited. This, in turn, caused the wood board to ignite.

Combined Effects

A number of fire scenarios can involve a sequence of two steps: overheating first, followed by arcing and ignition. For example, a wire may become heated either due to excessive current or due to a poor connection. This may soften the insulation sufficiently, so that a short circuit occurs at a place where the wire is bent or passes a metal edge.

The most important of the combined-effects situations is perhaps the last-strand problem. A number of fires occur either at the junction between a cord and the male plug, or at another place along the cord where repeated bending has taken place. This has been studied by several groups of researchers. Typically, it has been found that ignition of a plug or cord is associated specifically with the breakage of the last strand. Mitsuhashi et al.49 created failures of PVC-insulated cords so that only one strand remained. Using test cords of 30x0.18mm strands (rated 7A) or 50x0.18mm strands (rated 12A), they found that for ignition to occur, the load current had to be within a relatively narrow range. Ignition of the PVC insulation occurred only if the current was between 10 and 20A. Currents smaller than 10A equilibrated to steady-state temperatures of 100°C or less and did not lead to fusing of the last strand and ignition of the PVC. Conversely, currents over 20A caused a rapid fusion of the strand, and consequently did not deliver sufficient energy into the already-broken strands to raise their temperature sufficiently to ignite the insulation. PVC used for electric cords is moderately resistant to ignition-applying local flames or hot temperatures normally does not lead to a propagating fire of the polymer. But this changes if the material has been preheated. Thus, Mitsuhashi discovered that the overheating must not be too rapid. The sequence of events, then, is: overheating-fusing-arcing-stopping of current flow. The ignition occurs initially at only a tiny spot, but because a certain portion of the cord has been preheated to over 100°C, rapid flame spread can occur away from the ignition location. The authors did further heat transfer modeling and concluded that a gap of at least 1mm is needed for ignition to occur. Nagata⁵⁰ also conducted experiments and theoretical modeling and came to broadly similar conclusions. UL uses the last-strand problem in their "rotational flexing" test²⁴, where a stranded electrical cord is rotated enough times that one of the conductors suffers a break, and it is then examined whether cheesecloth, used as an ignition target, will ignite.

A PVC male plug can be ignited by repeated "hot plugging" while carrying a heavy load. Blades⁵¹ demonstrated this using a 1500W space heater as the load. The effect appears to be somewhat similar to the last-strand problem, in the repeated hot-plugging erodes the contact material, creates a poor connection, and heats up the PVC locally. Finally, arcing is able to cause ignition. The general problem of ignitions due to poor connection at the plug/receptacle interface has only been studied to a limited extent⁵², and systematic studies are not available in the English-language literature to describe conditions needed for a structure ignition. Several studies have been conducted in Japan, however. Based on laboratory studies, Ashizawa et al.⁵³ concluded that the steps leading to ignition are:

- a. Overcurrent and poor connection
- b. Thermal degradation of PVC
- c. Release of HCl gas from PVC
- *d.* Absorption of moisture by hygroscopic action of calcium carbonate filler
- e. Initiation of surface and internal scintillations
- *f*. Formation of carbonized paths in the PVC, both on the surface and internally
- g. Arcing
- h. Ignition.

Okamoto et al.⁵⁴ also conducted laboratory studies and came to a roughly similar conclusion. Uchida et al.⁵⁵ studied the problem of failures in plugs where attachment of the wire is by means of a screw connection.

A poor connection, followed by arcing and ignition can be created when a nail or staple splits apart a conductor in a nonmetallic cable. This, again, is a low probability event, but at least two researchers have documented it in laboratory experiments. Roberts⁵⁶ demonstrated this by splitting 12 and 14AWG nonmetallic cables with a nail. Brugger⁵⁷ used a staple to split a nonmetallic cable and reported that a glow occurs first.

External Heating

Most cases of external heating involve the wire or wiring device as "victim" of fire and not as the initiator of fire. But some situations do exist where external heating of wiring serves as the initiating event. In many cases, arcing occurs after sufficient overheating. Chavez⁵⁸ examined the electrical failure of two cables as a function of oven heating. Electrical failure was considered to be a short circuit or a low-resistance condition developed across the line; experiments were not conducted to actually elicit ignitions. A cable with cross-linked polyethylene insulation failed at 270°C, while a cable with polyethylene/PVC wire insulation and PVC jacket failed at 250°C. A NIST study on lighting fixtures⁵⁹ examined the effect of over-temperatures on 60°Crated normal building wiring. When overlamping of a fixture created 202–205°C temperatures in the electrical junction box, failure occurred in less than 65h. The wire insulation became brittle, cracked, fell away from the conductors, and this led to a short circuit.

Conclusions

In 1974 the author of a textbook on electrical insulation⁶⁰ wrote: "The fundamental breakdown processes are not understood; not for lack of experimental observations but because our background knowledge is too crude." Unfortunately, even today this statement remains true, as concerns wiring and wiring devices in buildings.

Claims are sometimes made that a significant fraction of fires assigned to electrical causes has been mis-investigated⁶¹. But, despite the recent efforts in NFPA 921 to make high quality information available to the investigator, this is very hard to do in the absence of adequate published research studies.

It is surprising how little systematic research has been done to elucidate and quantify the mechanisms whereby electric wiring faults lead to structure ignitions. Almost all of the experimental papers that could be found studied problems only of a very narrow scope. In addition, a number of them (mostly not reviewed here) have approached the topic by attempting to prove that certain modes of ignition "cannot happen." This, of course, is hardly good scientific methodology, but is an easy trap to fall into, when it is realized that failures of highly reliable devices are involved.

Not a single paper from a U.S. university was found on the topic, nor is there any agency or research institute in the US that has carried on long-term research on these problems. It might be noted that in Japan, elucidating the nature of electrical ignitions has been considered to be a problem of national priority, and several institutes and universities have done considerable long-term research, but these studies are generally available only in Japanese.

Without adequate laboratory studies documenting and quantifying electric-wiring-related fire ignition scenarios, little progress can be expected either in improving fire investigations or in reducing fire losses of this origin.

In the U.S., the safety of wiring and wiring devices is generally assessed according to UL standards, but there exists almost no published material from UL that would document their studies of ignition mechanisms, nor to provide a basis for judging whether their test procedures have a traceable connection to field failure modes.

Aging of plastic materials can lead to increased failures. This has been studied in other electrotechnical areas (e.g., aircraft wiring), but no studies exist for building wiring.

Acknowledgement

This paper was originally presented at the Fire and Materials 2001 conference and the permission of Interscience Communications Ltd. to reprint it in the Fire and Arson Investigator is gratefully acknowledged.



ABOUT THE AUTHOR: Vyto Babrauskas holds degrees in Physics (A.B.), Structural Engineering (M.S.), and Fire Protection Engineering (Ph.D.), While still in graduate school, he was the first U.S. scientist to release a computer room fire model (1975). For 16 years he conducted fire research at NIST, where he invented the Cone Calorimeter and the furniture calorimeter, finalized the radiant toxicity test method, and contributed to NIST fire modeling efforts. He has published over 200 papers and reports and is the North American editor of Fire Safety Journal. He was the co-author of two books: Heat Release in Fires (1992), and Flammability Behavior of Upholstered furniture and Mattresses (2001) and is now in the final stages of preparing a major new book, Ignition Handbook. In 1993 he established Fire Science and Technology Inc., a firm specializing in fire safety R&D and consulting. Much of his current work involves fire science support to fire investigations and litigations.

REFERENCES

1. Rohr, K. D., The U.S. Home Product Report (Appliances and Equipment Involved in Fires), Fire Analysis & Research Div., National Fire Protection Assn., Quincy MA (2000)

2. Fire in the United States 1985-1994, 9th ed., US Fire Administration, Emmitsburg MD (1997).

3. Statistical Abstract of the United States 1999, Tables 2, 1212, and 1213, Government Printing Office (1999).

4. Ault, K., Singh, H., and Smith, L., *1996 Residential Fire Loss Estimates*, Consumer Product Safety Commission, Washington.
5. Hall, J. R., Jr., Bukowski, R. W., and Gomberg, A., *Analysis of Electrical Fire Investigations in Ten Cities* (NBSIR 83-2803), [U.S.] Natl. Bur. Stand., Gaithersburg MD (1983). 6. Smith, L. E., and McCoskrie, D., *What Causes Wiring Fires in Residences*,

Fire J. 84, 19-24, 69 (Jan/Feb 1990).

7. Olyphant, M. Jr., Arc Resistance. I. Tracking Processes in Thermosetting Insulating Materials, ASTM Bull. No. 181, 60-67. II. Effect of Testing Conditions on Tracking Properties of Thermosetting Insulating Materials, No. 185, 41-38 (1952).

8. Test Method for High-Voltage, Low-Current Dry Arc Resistance of Solid Electrical Insulation (ASTM D 495), American Society for Testing and Materials, West Conshohocken PA

9. Electrical Arcing of Aged Aircraft Wire (Report N191-RPT4AU99), Report to NTSB under Order No. NTSB18-99-SP0127, Lectromechanical Design Co., Sterling VA (1999).

10. Billings, M. J., Smith, A., and Wilkins, R., Tracking in Polymeric Insulation, *IEEE Trans. Elec. Insul.* IE-2, 131-137 (Dec. 1967).

11. Noto, F., and Kawamura, K., Tracking and Ignition Phenomena of Polyvinyl Chloride Resin Under Wet Polluted Conditions, IEEE Trans. Elec. Insul. EI-13, 418-425 (1978)

12. Method for Determining the Comparative and the Proof Tracking Indices of Solid Insulating Materials under Moist Conditions (IEC 60112), International Electrotechnical Commission, Geneva (1979).

13. Nagata, M., and Yokoi, Y., Deterioration and Firing Properties of Polyvinyl Chloride Covering Cords at Elevated Temperatures, Bull. Japan Assn. of Fire Science and Engineering 33:2, 25-29 (1983). 14. Hagimoto, Y., Watanabe, N., and Okamoto, Arcing Faults on PVC-covered

Electrical Cords, pp. 221-224 in Proc. 1st Conf. of the Assn. of Korean-Japanese Safety Engineering Society, Kyongju, Korea (1999)

15. Dunki-Jacobs, J. R., The Escalating Arcing Ground-Fault Phenomenon, IEEE Trans. Ind. Appl. IA-22, 1156-1161 (1986).

16. Mesina, J. G., Determination of Electrical Clearances for Permissible Equipment Operating in Gassy Mines and Tunnels, IEEE Trans. Ind. Appl. IA-30, 1339-1350 (1994)

17. Béland, B., Electrical Damages-Cause or Consequence? J. Forensic Sciences 29, 747-761 (1984).

18. Zimmerer, C. W., and Neumer, F., Aluminum Building Wires and Connectors (Bull. of Research No. 48), Underwriters Laboratories Inc., Chicago (1954).

19. Ettling, B. V., Ignitability of PVC Electrical Insulation by Arcing, IAAI-Oregon Chapter Newsletter, 6 (Mar. 1997).

20. Guide for Fire and Explosion Investigations (NFPA 921), National Fire

Protection Assn., Quincy, MA (1998). 21. Kinoshita, K., Hagimoto, Y., and Watanabe, N., *Investigation Reports and* Igniting Experiments on the Electrical Causes of Many Fires Started after the Big Earthquake in Kobe Area in 1995, published in Urgent Study Reports on the Hanshin-Awaji Big Earthquake, Science and Technology Agency of Japan, Tokyo (1995)

22. Franklin, F. F., Circuit Breakers: The Myth of Safety, Fire and Arson *Investigator* 41, 42-45 (June 1991). 23. Nishida, Y., Ignition Hazard by Short Circuit between Element Wires of a

Stranded Cord, Reports of the National Research Institute of Police Science 45:4, 57 (Nov. 1992)

 Wagner, R. V., Boden, P. J., Skuggevig, W., and Davidson, R. J., *Technology for Detecting and Monitoring Conditions That Could Cause Electrical Wiring System Fires* (UL Project NC233, 94ME78760), Underwriters Laboratories Inc., Northbrook IL (1995).

25. Yamamoto, T., et al., A Test on Cables on Fire from Over Electric Current, Mitsubishi Cable Industries Review, No. 92, 41-47 (June 1997)

26. Lawson, D. I., McGuire, J. H., Fires Due to Electric Cables (FR Note 55), Fire Research Station, Borehamwood, England (1953)

27. Béland, B., Considerations on Arcing as a Fire Cause, Fire Technology 18, 188-202 (1982)

28. Popular Extension Cord Reels Can Be Real Dangerous, Fire Findings 2:1, 13 (Winter 1994)

29. Hagimoto, Y., Kinoshita, K., and Watanabe, N., Fire Hazard of a Coiled or

Bundled Cord, Summary of 1994 Annual Meeting of JAFSE (1994) 30. Béland, B., Fires of Electrical Origin, Fire and Arson Investigator 43, 35-41

(Dec. 1992)

31. Béland, B., Ground Fault in Flexible Exhaust Duct, Fire and Arson Investigator 44, 44-45 (June 1994)

(REFERENCES—continued on page 49)



STAFF

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR Alan Clark, Grinnell, Iowa

OFFICE MANAGER Marsha Sipes, Bridgeton, Missouri

SECRETARY Jennifer Turner, Bridgeton, Missouri

DIRECTOR OF GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS Stephen P. Austin, Wilmington, Delaware

> CHAPLAIN Bill Buckley, CFI, Tampa, Florida

GENERAL COUNSEL Michael J. Pavlisin, Esq, Wheaton, Illinois

FINANCIAL ADVISOR William T. Wright, Annandale, Virginia

PARLIAMENTARIAN Robert J. Doran, Sr., Inverness, Florida

SARGENTS-AT-ARMS Robert Gentile, Palm Beach Gardens, Florida Frederick A. Kempski, Paw Paw, Michigan Joseph Molnar, Clarkesville, Georgia Dean Price, McPherson, Kansas

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF Pamela L. Craig-White, B.S.–Meriden, Connecticut

TECHNICAL EDITOR Timothy G. Huff, M.A.–Laytonville, California

EDITORIAL BOARD Pamela L. Craig-White, Chair-Connecticut Michael A. Schlatman, CFI, Cochair-Kansas Joseph M. Bloom-Oregon Bruce Ettling-Washington Richard Johnson-Wisconsin Ronald Lapina-Pennsylvania Carter D. Roberts, MBA-Texas David Schudel, PH.D-Cayman Islands Peter G. Willse-Connecticut Joseph Zicherman-California

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS Stephen P. Austin–Delaware R. Kirk Hankins, CFI, B.S.–Missouri Richard B. Lindsay, ESQ–British Columbia, Canada Michael A. Schlatman, CFI–Kansas James A. Shinsky–Michigan Peter A. Sloan, AFAINZ, ACLA, MSAE–New Zealand

The *Fire & Arson Investigator* Magazine (ISSN: 1059-7298) is published four times per year in January, April, July and October by the International Association of Arson Investigators, 12770 Boenker Road, Bridgeton, Missouri 63044, (314) 739-4224. Annual dues for members is \$50 (includes \$10.00 subscription to *Fire & Arson Investigator* Magazine). Periodicals postage paid at Bridgeton, Missouri, and at additional mailing offices.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the *Fire & Arson Investigator* Magazine, International Association of Arson Investigators, 12770 Boenker Road, Bridgeton, Missouri 63044.

The *Fire & Arson Investigator* Magazine is the official publication of the International Association of Arson Investigators, Inc. The publication is solely an educational and advisory aid to members working to suppress the crime of arson and related offenses; and to assist in raising the level of expertise in fire investigation.

Articles herein express the views and opinions of the authors, which are not necessarily those of the International Association of Arson Investigators, Inc., or its editors. Editor reserves the right to accept or reject any article or advertisement submitted for publication.

An advertisement in the IAAI magazine does not constitute, and shall not be interpreted as, an endorsement of the advertiser or the product. Advertisers shall not use the IAAI name or image in their commercial activities in any manner.

table of contents

| President's Message. 2 |
|---|
| Conference/Seminar Calendar |
| We Got Mail! |
| New South Wales Bushfires–Ross Brogan |
| Fraud Fire Committee Column |
| Beware–Peter A. Sloan, AFAINZ, ACLA, MSAE, MIAAI |
| The Northern Exposure–Shelley A. Braun & Richard B. Lindsay, ESQ 14 |
| FISC Bulletin Board– <i>Terry Lacy.</i> |
| Residential Propane Tank Bleve–C.T. Carley & H. A. Koelling |
| Terrorism!-Seminar Dealing with Weapons of Mass Destruction. 37 |
| WI 2002 IAAI AGM & Conference Registration |
| National Center for Forensic Science–Thomas E. Minnich & Major Ron |
| McCardle |
| Chapters' Corner |
| How Do Electrical Wiring Faults Lead to Structure Ignitions?-Vytenis |
| Babrauskas, PH.D |
| Our Changing World–Part 2–John D. DeHaan, PH.D |
| 2002 IAAI Tradeshow Registration |
| Recalls –U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission |
| CFI Committee Report–Kirk Hankins |
| Awards Committee (Nomination Instructions & Form) |
| AAITII Seminar |
| How to Submit an Article for Publication |
| John Charles Wilson Scholarship |
| Application for Membership |
| Advertisers Index |
| Nomination Form |

(Cover photo by Martin Nate Rawner, Los Angeles, California. This photograph was awarded Third Place-Rescue in the 2001 California Fire Photographers Association (CFPA) Photography Contest. All rights reserved, no portion of this photo may be reproduced without permission.)