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This report describes an analytical investigation of techniques to calculate the transfer functions relating lightning-induced voltages in aircraft electrical circuits to aircraft physical characteristics and lightning current parameters. The analytical work was carried out concurrently with an experimental program of measurements of lightning-induced voltages in the electrical circuits of an F89-J aircraft. A computer program, ETCAL, developed earlier to calculate resistive and inductive transfer functions is refined to account for skin effect, providing results more valid over a wider range of lightning waveshapes than formerly possible. A computer program, WING, is derived to calculate the resistive and inductive transfer functions between a basic aircraft wing and a circuit conductor inside it. Good agreement is obtained between transfer inductances calculated by WING and those reduced from measured data by ETCAL. This computer program shows promise of expansion to permit eventual calculation of potential lightning-induced voltages in electrical circuits of complete aircraft in the design stage.
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SUMMARY

From measured lightning-induced voltages in aircraft electrical circuits, it has been possible to derive resistive and inductive transfer functions relating these voltages to the lightning current parameters. This derivation has been accomplished with a computer program, ETCAL, which was developed for this purpose several years ago when this analysis was first attempted, under NASA Contract NAS3-12019, the results of which were published in NASA CR-1744 (ref. 1) in 1970. The transfer functions obtained by the analysis of reference 1 were observed to be dependent upon the lightning current waveform, indicating a deficiency in the analytical procedure, since the airframe is believed to be comprised of inactive, linear elements whose characteristics remain the same regardless of current amplitude or waveshape. Since lightning currents are rapidly changing and of short duration, the time required for diffusion of such currents through the aircraft skin (e.g., skin effect) is probably significant, although it was not factored mathematically into the original transfer function analysis. In the belief that skin effect is significant, the transfer function analysis was refined in a continuation of this work sponsored by NASA under Contract NAS3-14836. A suitable representation of the time constant of skin penetration was obtained from the literature and factored into ETCAL, with the result that transfer functions now derived are more consistent throughout the range of lightning stroke waveshapes at which comparison data derived from other measurements was available. ETCAL has been re-written and is published in this report. With it, measured induced voltage data can be utilized to determine the resistive and inductive transfer functions relating lightning currents to voltages induced in an aircraft electrical circuit of interest.

At the same time, work was initiated on a completely analytical technique to arrive at the same transfer functions. This is a mathematical representation of an aircraft wing and a hypothetical electrical circuit conductor inside. Some simplifying assumptions relating to wing geometry and lightning current flow are made in the first attempt. The magnetic flux linking the circuit and flux density at the conductor location are calculated as functions of an assumed lightning current filament in the wing skin. The contributions from a large number of such filaments
assumed to comprise the wing are summed to obtain the total magnetic flux density and flux linking the line-integral path of the conductor and its airframe return. From this, the transfer inductance, \( M \), is easily derived. The resistive transfer function, \( R_s \), is calculated as a function of geometry and material resistivity, so it is the d-c resistance and not the effective resistance calculated by ETCAL. Realizing this, however, and estimating the effective resistance from it, the resulting values of \( R_s \) and \( M \) compared well with corresponding values obtained via ETCAL from measured induced voltages on a circuit inside an F89-J aircraft wing.

The prospects for refining WING to account for physical peculiarities such as resistive bonds, access doors, non-uniform lightning current flow and others appear promising, as well as the possibility of modeling other sections of airframe in this manner and combining them to represent a complete aircraft. The resulting tool would be a powerful means for aircraft designers to evaluate prospective electrical circuit compatibility in the lightning environment and eliminate potential lightning effects problems before they become troublesome on production aircraft.
INTRODUCTION

This report describes an analysis of lightning-induced voltages in aircraft electrical circuits. The work reported herein builds upon former analytical work performed under NASA Contract NAS3-12019, "Measurements and Analysis of Lightning-Induced Voltages in Aircraft Electrical Circuits" (ref. 1). In the present work, progress has been made towards two broad objectives:

1. Determination of the transfer functions relating measured lightning-induced voltages to lightning current and airframe parameters.

2. Development of a modeling technique for calculating lightning-induced voltages in various aircraft electrical circuits.

The need for a greater understanding of the transfer functions of objective (1) is apparent because these functions can ultimately tell us more about the various factors influencing the susceptibility of particular aircraft electrical circuits to lightning. In the previous experimental program, (ref. 1) a computer program (ETCAL) was developed which enabled the reduction of the resistive and inductive transfer functions, $R_s$ and $M$, respectively, from measured oscillographic induced voltage data. In some circuits upon which measurements were made, a general correlation between aircraft structural characteristics and these transfer functions was apparent, but for other circuits, the meaning of them was unclear. In addition, the values of $R_s$ and $M$ were often dependent upon current waveshape - a fact which caused some discomfort since, in theory, transfer functions should be dependent upon the aircraft circuit and airframe physical characteristics only. Accordingly, further analysis work was performed under this contract to learn more about these factors. If these parameters can be understood in terms of tangible wing structure and wing electrical circuit characteristics, aircraft designers may be better able to design aircraft circuits which minimize lightning-induced voltages. The work accomplished toward this objective is presented in Section I of this report.

All research conducted in the former program was for the purpose of measuring and understanding the possible lightning-induced voltages in an existing airframe. Of even greater importance is the problem of determining the possible levels of lightning-induced voltages in new aircraft during the design stage. If a reliable technique were available for this purpose, aircraft designers could evaluate the consequences of various alternate
structural and electrical system designs as far as lightning is concerned. If the results showed unacceptable induced voltage levels, protection could be designed into the system or a remedial design modification utilized. The second objective of this program, therefore, was to formulate a simple analytical model of a basic airframe component and evaluate its authenticity. If successful, such a model would show the methods needed for later development of a more extensive model for use in aircraft design evaluations.

The main text of this report is divided into two sections. Section I covers the transfer function analysis and development of the computer program, ETCAL, to derive the effective transfer functions from measured induced voltage data. Section II describes the basic theory and development of a computer program, WING, to calculate the transfer functions for various electrical circuits enclosed within an aircraft wing. An Appendix includes the detailed mathematical derivations of the magnetic flux formulas utilized by the computer program, WING.
SECTION I - TRANSFER FUNCTION ANALYSIS

TRANSFER FUNCTIONS

A mechanism by which lightning can affect aircraft electrical and avionics systems is by the generation of magnetically-induced and resistive voltage rises within aircraft electrical circuitry. These voltages may or may not be harmful to the circuits themselves, as well as the avionics equipment to which these circuits are connected. Even if the aircraft has an electrically continuous metallic skin, its non-cylindrical geometry will enable some magnetic flux to be present within the wing and fuselage, even if all of the lightning current were to flow through the skin only. This magnetic flux will link electrical circuits within these enclosures, causing induced voltages. Similarly, the finite resistivity of the metallic skin will permit resistive voltage rises within the skin (or structure) along the path of lightning current flow. If an aircraft electrical circuit happens to employ the structure as return path, then this resistive voltage enters this circuit, in series with the magnetically-induced voltage in the same circuit and any other (normal) steady-state voltages present. Capacitively coupled voltages may also be produced in these circuits; however the essentially uniform conducting skin of metallic aircraft keeps potential differences among structural elements low, thereby limiting the voltages which can be electrostatically coupled to interior electrical circuits. In practice, experimental measurements have shown magnetic and resistive components to be the most predominant.

In the previous program (ref. 1) an expression was derived for the induced voltage appearing at the open circuit terminals of any aircraft electrical circuit, as follows:

\[ e_{oc}(t) = R_s i_L(t) + M \frac{di_L(t)}{dt} \]  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where

- \( R_s \) = an effective structural resistance (ohms)
- \( i_L(t) \) = an expression for the time varying lightning current (amperes)
- \( M \) = an effective inductive coupling factor (henrys).

Equation (1) permits expression of the open circuit-induced voltage in terms of the lightning current and two transfer
functions $R_s$ and $M$. Equation (1) is the result of an effort to reduce the complete complex wing structure and circuitry to a simple, two terminal Thevenin equivalent circuit consisting of all linear components. The Thevenin equivalent circuit parameters representing each wing circuit were obtained from measurements of open circuit-induced voltages ($e_{oc}$) and short circuit currents ($i_{sc}$) at the terminals of the wing circuits. The reason for obtaining the Thevenin equivalent circuit is that the induced voltage seen by any load (appropriate avionics) connected to the circuit may then be calculated.

For equation (1) to be strictly correct for all time varying functions of $i_L$, the transfer functions $R_s$ and $M$ must be constant for all time, or at least for the time domains characteristic of natural lightning. In other words, values of $R_s$ and $M$ derived from a set of data taken at one lightning current waveform should accurately describe the relationship between another lightning current waveform and the corresponding voltage induced in the same circuit. In previous measurements, this was not often the case. For example, reference 1, tables X and XIV illustrate $R_s$ and $M$ reduced from the "fast" and "slow" lightning current waveforms utilized in tests on both a position lamp and armament power supply circuit. (Note that $R$ is given the subscript $w$ to signify its application to a wing upon which these measurements were made.) These tables are reproduced here as tables I and II and illustrate a marked change in both $R_w$ and $M$ when the waveform is changed from the slow ($36 \times 82 \mu sec$) waveform to the fast ($8.2 \times 14 \mu sec$) waveform. This data is from tests on an F89-J aircraft wing as described in reference 1.

This fact has been disconcerting since it diminishes the validity of the $R$ and $M$ transfer functions in predicting the voltage to be induced in a circuit by a lightning current waveform other than the one being applied in a test. Yet, intuition and basic theory of linear systems indicates that the transfer functions should not be waveform or time dependent. In this program, therefore, some effort was expended to further evaluate the initial derivation of $R$ and $M$ in an effort to discover the cause of the variations.

Skin Effect

In the previous analysis of reference 1, no account had been taken of the "skin effect" phenomena. As an introduction to skin effect, consider a long cylindrical conductor as shown in figure 1,
TABLE I - CALCULATED EFFECTIVE WING RESISTANCES AND MUTUAL INDUCTANCES FOR VARIOUS TEST CONDITIONS

Circuit L,050, Position Light
Conductor 2L10E18 and Airframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stroke Location</th>
<th>Slow Wave Form ((36 \times 82 \mu s))</th>
<th>Fast Wave Form ((8.2 \times 14 \mu s))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(R_w) (microhms)</td>
<td>(M) (nanohenrys)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Forward End of Tip Tank</td>
<td>450.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Outboard Leading Edge</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Trailing Edge of Aileron</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Center of Wing Surface</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Inboard Leading Edge</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Formerly table X from ref. 1)
TABLE II - CALCULATED EFFECTIVE WING RESISTANCES AND MUTUAL INDUCTANCES FOR VARIOUS TEST CONDITIONS

Circuit S.220, Armament Power Supply
Conductor 2SF3886E20 and Airframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stroke Location</th>
<th>Slow Wave Form (36 x 82 µs)</th>
<th>Fast Wave Form (8.2 x 14 µs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_W$ (microhms)</td>
<td>$M$ (nanohenrys)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Forward End of Tip Tank</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>-0.00028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Outboard Leading Edge</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.000224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Trailing Edge of Aileron</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-0.000336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Center of Wing Surface</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>-0.00028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Inboard Leading Edge</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.000224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Formerly table XIV from ref. 1)
FIGURE 1 - IDEALIZED CYLINDER AND INNER CONDUCTOR
FIGURE 2—CURRENT DENSITY IN CYLINDER WALL AT VARIOUS TIMES
whose length is long when compared to its diameter so that end effects can be neglected. If a step function of current, I, is injected into one end of this conductor, the total current will initially be confined to the outer surface.

This condition is the result of the magnetic fields, which initially force all the current to flow on the exterior surface of the cylinder, and is the phenomenon of skin effect. As time passes, however, the current will diffuse inward until eventually a condition of equilibrium is reached at $t_f$ when the current density throughout the cylinder wall is uniform.

As the current diffuses into the cylinder wall, the current density at various times would probably appear as shown in figure 2. The current density is initially infinite and confined to an infinitesimally thin shell. For a final condition, $t_f$, the current density will be uniform throughout the wall thickness. At any time the area under the current density curve must equal the total input current. The current density at the inner wall will increase as shown in figure 3.

\[ J = \frac{I}{A} \]

\[ I = \text{TOTAL CURRENT IN CYLINDER} \]

\[ A = \text{AREA OF WALL CROSS SECTION} \]

Corresponding to this time variation of the current density must be a time varying magnetic flux. The magnetic flux will initially be external to the cylinder. As the current diffuses through the cylinder wall, so will a magnetic field diffuse through the cylinder.
If a conductor, AB, is placed along the center of the cylinder of figure 1, and is connected to the ungrounded end of the cylinder as at B, a voltage, v, will be developed between this conductor and the grounded end of the cylinder. This voltage is found by integrating the electric potential around the loop formed by the conductor and the cylinder wall (either the inner or the outer wall).

If the current density is assumed to be uniform over the length of the cylinder and one integrates around the loop, ABCD, formed by the conductor and the inner wall, the voltage v, developed between the conductor and the cylinder at the grounded end can be shown to be:

\[
v = \int_0^l J_1 \rho dl = J_1 \rho l \tag{2}
\]

where

- \( J_1 \) = the current density on the inner wall at any time (t).
- \( \rho \) = the resistivity of the conductor wall
- \( l \) = the total length of the cylinder.

If one evaluates the voltage developed in the loop formed by the conductor and the outer wall of the cylinder, the path encircles some magnetic flux and the equation becomes:

\[
v = J_2 \rho l - \frac{d\phi}{dt} \tag{3}
\]

where

- \( J_2 \) = the current density at the outer wall at any time (t).
- \( \frac{d\phi}{dt} \) = the time derivative of the flux buildup in the cylinder wall.

Associated with the diffusing currents is the fact that the effective cross-section of current path is also changing. Because the
same total current is passing through a varying cross-sectional area, the effective resistance must also be varying, due to the relation:

\[ R = \frac{\rho \ell}{a} \]  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where

\[ \rho = \text{material resistivity (constant)} \]
\[ \ell = \text{length (constant)} \]
\[ a = \text{area of current flow - time varying.} \]

By similar reasoning, the magnetic flux appearing at the inside of the cylinder wall is also time variant. As a result, the resistive and magnetic components of any voltages induced between an internal conductor and the cylinder wall would be expected to be time variant due to skin effect in addition to being time variant due to the lightning current waveform and its differential as predicted by equation (1). Since equation (1) is applicable for circuits using the airframe as ground return, and is actually the line integral taken along the circuit conductor and the inside of the airframe as return, the coupling factors it sees are those apparent from the inside of the structure. These are related in turn to the current flowing on the inside of the structure wall and this current is itself a time varying function, beginning at zero and reaching a maximum sometime later.

According to Witt (ref. 2), the time constant of the build-up of voltage in a solid coaxial such as the cylinder of figure 1 will be approximately

\[ T_M \approx \mu_0 \delta^2 \rho \] (seconds) \hspace{1cm} (5)

where

\[ \delta = \text{wall thickness in meters} \]
\[ \rho = \text{resistivity in ohm-meters} \]
\[ \mu_0 = \text{permeability of free space (4\pi x 10^{-7} henrys per meter)} \]

The time constant thus varies with the square of the wall thickness of the cylinder, inversely with the resistivity of the material, and linearly with its permeability. Witt's derivation
was for a non-magnetic cylinder and, of course, the materials utilized in aircraft structures are nearly all non-magnetic. The derivation for an obround structure such as a wing has not been accomplished; however, that function is not expected to differ much from the cylindrical case of equation (5).

The point to be made by this discussion is that although the wing is not a cylinder it does have skin thickness and there is a time constant associated with the diffusion of the injected current throughout the wing.

The current $i_L$ as used in equation (1) should, therefore, be the current appearing at the inner skin surface. In this case, equation (1) relating the induced voltage to the lightning current, $i_L$, should be modified to express the open circuit induced voltage, $e_{oc}$, in terms of the component of the lightning current appearing at the inside surface of the structure, as follows:

$$
e_{oc} = R_s i_L(t) + M \frac{d(1-e^{-\alpha t})}{dt} i_L(t)$$

(6)

where:

- $e_{oc}$ = induced voltage appearing across open circuit terminals
- $R_s$ = the effective structural resistance
- $M$ = an effective transfer inductance between the lightning current and the particular electrical circuit
- $i_L(t)$ = lightning current (a time-varying function)
- $\alpha$ = the reciprocal of the time constant of current penetration into the aircraft skin.

It will be noted that this is equation (1) with the factor

$$(1-e^{-\alpha t})$$

(7)

added to correct the total lightning current, $i_L$, for the portion of it appearing on the inside of the structure. The exponent, $\alpha$, in the above expression is the reciprocal of the time constant of current penetration into the aircraft skin.
Since much of the resistance $R_s$ is caused by bonds between various structural elements, these resistances must be lumped and the behavior of lightning currents flowing through them may not be identical to the diffusion process described for currents in a solid conducting skin. Therefore, the skin effect correction factor (eq. 7) has been omitted from the resistive term in equation (6) and the term $R_s$ must therefore be defined as the "effective" resistance to lightning current flow, rather than the DC resistance.

The factor $e^{-\alpha t}$ utilized to account for skin effect is not rigorously correct, but is instead an acceptable approximation of the skin effect diffusion process - a complex mathematical function not readily expressible in terms of the aircraft skin geometries of interest here. The exponential function used instead is more mathematically tractable and well within the bounds of accuracy imposed by other simplifications on these analytical procedures.

At time $t = 0$, expression (7) goes to zero and so does equation (6). At later times, (7) is increasing but always less than 1 until $t = \infty$. Thus, the effective "amount" of $i_L$ in equation (6) is lessened at the earlier times and thus the factor (7) has the overall effect of changing the rate-of-rise of $i_L$ in the expression for the magnetic component.

The magnitude of the time constant $(1/\alpha)$ associated with current penetration of the F89-J wing would vary with location on the wing, and would be difficult to obtain rigorously because:

1. The wing skin thickness tapers from the center out to the leading and trailing edges.
2. The wing skin thickness tapers from the root end to the tip.
3. The current injection points vary.
4. There are discontinuities such as wheel well openings, antenna openings, and spacing between the wing tip and the wing tip fuel tank.

For the purpose of introducing skin effect into the ETGAL analysis to see if more consistent values of $R$ and $M$ would result, an average skin thickness was assumed for the entire wing, and calculations were run for thicknesses, $\delta$, of .080" and .125" aluminum. Solving equation (5) for these thicknesses resulted in penetration time constants as follows:
For = .080" aluminum,

$$T_m = \frac{\mu_0 \delta^2}{6\rho}$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

$$= \left(4\pi \times 10^{-7} \text{ henrys/meter} \right) \left(\frac{.01 \text{ meter}}{\text{cm}} \right) \left(\frac{.080 \text{ inches}}{.3937 \text{ inches/centimeter}} \right)^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

$$T_m = 30 \text{ microseconds.}$$

In a similar manner, $T_m$ for a skin thickness of 0.125" is 74.2 microseconds. The F89-J wing skin thicknesses vary from 0.040" to 0.267" but the materials within which most of the wiring is located would appear to have 0.125" as a mean. Accordingly, the time constant,

$$T_m = 74.2 \text{ microseconds}$$

was used to derive $\alpha$, where

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{74.2 \times 10^{-6}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

for use in equation (1).

If it is assumed that a period of 3 time constants must elapse before currents are equally distributed throughout the skin, this will be the time required for maximum current to appear on the inside surface of the skin. For lightning currents rising to crest and beginning their decay in less than this period the skin current penetration process will have the effect of slowing down the rise time of lightning current reaching the inside surface of the skin and diminishing its amplitude there. Thus, 0.125" skins with a time constant of 74.2 microseconds should provide greater shielding of internal electrical circuits against the effects of the 8 and 24 microsecond rising lightning currents simulated in the program, than an 0.080" skin whose time constant is only 30 microseconds.

ETCAL Computer Program

The ETCAL computer program described in reference 1 was revised to factor in skin effect, as expressed in equations (5) and (6). This program is presented in figure 4. A flow diagram illustrating the operation of this program is presented in figure 5. The derivation of the ETCAL analysis is otherwise the same as that presented in reference 1.
ETCAL
1 REM THIS PROGRAM CALCULATES THE RESISTIVE TRANSFER FUNCTION
2 REM R AND INDUCTIVE TRANSFER FUNCTION M FROM INDUCED
3 REM VOLTAGES MEASURED IN A PARTICULAR CIRCUIT IN AN AIRCRAFT
4 REM AS A FUNCTION OF THE LIGHTNING CURRENT AMPLITUDE AND
5 REM WAVEFORM. OUTPUTS ARE: R (OHMS), M (HENRYS), AND A
6 REM TABLE OF CALCULATED INDUCED VOLTAGES E(T) VS TIME (T) FOR
7 REM ALL TIME, BASED ON R AND M. E(T) IS IN Volts, T IN SECONDS.
8 REM INPUTS ARE:
9 REM I1 = MAX AMPLITUDE (CREST) OF LIGHTNING CURRENT (IN AMPS)
10 REM I4 = IMAX FOR EXPONENTIAL LIGHTNING CURRENT FORMULA (IN AMPS)
11 REM A = ALPHA EXPONENT FROM THE LIGHTNING FORMULA (IN 1/SECONDS)
12 REM B = BETA
13 REM E1 = MEASURED OPEN CIRCUIT INDUCED VOLTAGE AT LIGHTNING
14 REM CURRENT CREST TIME (IN VOLTS)
15 REM T2 = TIME OF INDUCED VOLTAGE ZERO INTERSECT (IN SECONDS)
16 REM P = DURATION OF OPEN CIRCUIT INDUCED VOLTAGE (IN SECONDS)
17 REM D = STEPS FOR THE INDUCED VOLTAGE PLOT (IN SECONDS)
18 REM M = DATA OSCILLOGRAM NUMBER
19 REM L = LIGHTNING STROKE ATTACHMENT POINT (ANY CONVENIENT NO.)
20 REM C = AIRCRAFT CIRCUIT IDENTIFICATION NO. (MUST BE NUMBERS ONLY)
21 REM S = TIME CONSTANT OF LIGHTNING CURRENT PENETRATION INTO
22 REM THE AIRCRAFT SKIN (IN SECONDS)
100 READ I1,I4,A,B,E1,T2,P,D,M,L,C,S
107 PRINT "ACFT CIRCUIT NO:"; C; "OSC NO:"; M; "STROKE LOC:"; L
108 PRINT
110 LET R=E1/I1
115 PRINT "R="; R
130 LET T=T2
150 G0 SUB 1200
160 LET M=-I1*R/I1
165 PRINT
170 PRINT "M="; M
175 PRINT
180 PRINT" T (SEC) E(T) VOLTS"
181 PRINT" "
190 FOR T = 0 TO P STEP D
200 G0 SUB 1200
210 LET E=I1*R+M*I1
220 PRINT T;E
222 IF T>P-.5E-6 THEN 8990
230 NEXT T
1200 LET I=(I4/I1)*I1*(EXP(-A*T)-EXP(-B*T))
1300 LET I2=(I4/I1)*I1*(-A*EXP(-A*T)+B*EXP(-B*T))
1400 LET I3=(I1/S)*I1*EXP(-(I1/S)*T)+(1-EXP(-(I1/S)*T))*I2
1600 IF T<=P THEN 1900
1700 LET I=0
1800 LET I2=0
1850 LET I3=0
1900 RETURN
8990 PRINT
8991 PRINT
9000 G0 TO 100
9100 DATA
9999 END

FIGURE 4 - COMPUTER PROGRAM "ETCAL" IN BASIC LANGUAGE
FOR GE TIME SHARING COMPUTER SYSTEM

15
ETCAL

READ DATA

CALCULATE
\[ R \cdot \frac{\Delta e}{i_L} \]  
\[ I \cdot \frac{\Delta i_L}{\text{crest}} \]

PRINT R

SET I = T_2

GO TO SUBROUTINE 1200

RETURN FROM SUBROUTINE 1200

CALCULATE
\[ M = -\frac{i_L R}{d_i_L/dt} \]
\[ I = T_2 \]

PRINT M

PRINT e(1)

TABLE HEADINGS

FOR I = 0 TO P STEP D

GO TO SUBROUTINE 1200

RETURN FROM SUBROUTINE 1200

CALCULATE
\[ e(1) = i_L + M \cdot \frac{d_i_L}{dt} \]
\[ I = I + 1 \]

PRINT I AND e(1)

DOES I = P

NO

YES

END

SUBROUTINE 1200

CALCULATE
\[ i_L \left( \frac{t}{T_1} \right) i_1 (e^{-at} - e^{-bt}) \]

CALCULATE
\[ i_2 \left( \frac{t}{T_1} \right) i_1 (e^{-at} - e^{-bt}) \left( 1 - \frac{1}{e^{\frac{t}{T_2}}} \right) \]

AT \[ I = T \]

CALCULATE
\[ \frac{d_i_L}{dt} = i_L \left( \frac{t}{T_1} \right) e^{-\frac{t}{T_1}} \]

\[ + \left( 1 - \frac{1}{e^{\frac{t}{T_2}}} \right) i_2 \]

FIGURE 5 - FLOW DIAGRAM OF COMPUTER PROGRAM, ETCAL, TO CALCULATE R AND M TRANSFER FUNCTIONS FROM LIGHTNING INDUCED VOLTAGE MEASUREMENTS.
Transfer Function Analysis

In this program, measurements were made of voltages induced in various circuits in a complete F89-J fighter aircraft at the Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, California. These measurements, most of which are reported in General Electric Report No. SRD-72-065, "A Test Technique for Measuring Lightning-Induced Voltages on Aircraft Electrical Circuits" describing the experimental phase of this program, were made with low amplitude simulated lightning currents generated by the aircraft transient analyzer also developed under this program. The measurements at China Lake included circuits in which similar measurements had been made previously under the "full scale" tests described in reference 1 at the GE High Voltage Laboratory. Included were the position lamp (circuit No. L.050) and the armament power supply (circuit No. S.220). The values of $R_w$ and $M$ derived from the original ETCAL analysis of reference 1 are those presented in tables I and II of this report.

The revised ETCAL program of figure 4 was utilized for derivation of $R_w$ and $M$ from the China Lake data obtained in this program. At China Lake, an attempt was made to duplicate lightning current waveshapes utilized in the work of reference 1, however, the aircraft transient analyzer utilized to generate the simulated lightning current at China Lake utilized a linear resistive waveshaping element, whereas the full-scale lightning simulator used earlier utilized a non-linear resistor. While fairly similar waveshapes can be generated, sufficient differences do exist to affect rate-of-rise, induced voltage levels and the resulting ETCAL analysis. The lightning current waveshapes applied at China Lake included a 24 x 72 microsecond waveform (fig. 6) and a 8 x 20 microsecond waveform (fig. 7). These figures show the actual lightning current waveforms applied as well as a plot of the mathematical approximation used. The mathematical expression for each is also given in the figures, and these expressions were utilized in the ETCAL analysis.

The oscillograms of open-circuit induced voltages measured in the position lamp and armament power supply circuits are shown in figure 8. The remaining data required by the ETCAL program were taken from these oscillograms. Table IIIa represents the values of the transfer functions $R_w$ and $M$ calculated by the program from data generated by the 8 x 20 microsecond and 24 x 72 microsecond waveforms. The values of $R_w$ and $M$ calculated without consideration of skin effect for the same circuits and somewhat similar test conditions from reference 1 are also presented, in table IIIb, for comparison purposes.
\[ i(t) = 2.3 I_1 \left[ e^{-0.0208t} - e^{-0.073t} \right] \]

\[ I_4 = 2.3 (I_1) \]

\[ A = 0.0208 \times 10^6 \text{ sec}^{-1} \]

\[ B = 0.073 \times 10^6 \text{ sec}^{-1} \]

**Figure 6** - 24 x 72 Microsecond Simulated Lightning Current Wave Shape
\[ i(t) = 3.03 I_1 \left[ e^{-0.0856 t} - e^{-0.214 t} \right] \]

\[ I_4 = 3.03 I_1 \]
\[ A = 0.0856 \times 10^6 \text{ sec}^{-1} \]
\[ B = 0.214 \times 10^6 \text{ sec}^{-1} \]

FIGURE 7 - 8 x 20 MICROSECOND SIMULATED LIGHTNING CURRENT WAVE SHAPE
FIGURE 8 - OPEN CIRCUIT VOLTAGES INDUCED IN THE POSITION LAMP & ARMAMENT POWER SUPPLY CIRCUITS OF AN F89-J AIRCRAFT AT NWC CHINA LAKE.
TABLE III - CALCULATED EFFECTIVE WING RESISTANCES AND MUTUAL INDUCTANCES, WITH AND WITHOUT CONSIDERATION OF SKIN EFFECT

a. Calculations by ETCAL of Figure 3 with Skin Affect
(From Measurements at China Lake on Complete F89-J Aircraft)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIRCUIT</th>
<th>Stroke Location</th>
<th>iL Wave Form:</th>
<th>Fast Wave Form (8 x 20 μs)</th>
<th>Slow Wave Form (24 x 72 μs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R_w (microhms)</td>
<td>M (nanohenrys)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.050</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Lamp (Conductor 2L10D18)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.220 Armament Power Supply (Conductor 2SF3821G20)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Calculations by Original ETCAL of Reference 1 Without Skin Effect
(From Measurements at GE-HVL on Wing of an F89-J Aircraft)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIRCUIT</th>
<th>Stroke Location</th>
<th>iL Wave Form:</th>
<th>Fast Wave Form (8.2 x 14 μs)</th>
<th>Slow Wave Form (36 x 82 μs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R_w (microhms)</td>
<td>M (nanohenrys)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.050</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>700.0</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Lamp (Conductor 2L10D18)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.220 Armament Power Supply (Conductor 2SF3886E20)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.0177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transfer Functions

After studying table III, it should be noted that for each circuit and stroke location there is much less of a percentage change in M resulting from the change in waveshapes than there was without the inclusion of skin effect in the analysis. Neither of the values of M calculated without skin effect is the same as the more consistent values calculated with skin effect. While the values calculated without skin effect accurately describe the induced voltage by equation (1) for the particular waveshape from which they were derived, they are inaccurate for other waveshapes. The degree of inaccuracy varies from case to case. If, however, M is reduced from data by the revised ETCAL program to include skin effect, it is apparent that together with $R_w$, it will more adequately describe the induced voltages generated by lightning current waveshapes other than the one whose data they were derived from, when used in equation (6).

Consistency in $R_w$ and M in spite of lightning current waveshape variations is expected since these are fundamentally inactive circuit constants based on airframe material characteristics of resistivity, permeability, and geometrical distances which are not, at least within the range of current amplitudes considered here, functions of applied electrical stress. The fact that the program calculates a fundamentally larger value of M for the position lamp circuit than for the armament circuit is probably because the position lamp employs the airframe as a return and is connected via a low impedance (the bulb) to the airframe at its extremity, whereas the armament power supply conductor upon which this measurement was made is open-circuited at the pylon junction box. In the latter case, the magnetically induced voltage in the loop formed by the conductor and the airframe is probably countered somewhat by a capacitively coupled component which is effectively in series with the magnetic component, and of opposite polarity to it. This is a result frequently seen in high impedance or open-ended circuits (ref. 1).

When a second skin thickness of 80 mils was used to determine the skin effect time constant by (5), no significant changes resulted in $R_w$ and M even though this diminishes the skin penetration time constant, $T_m$, to 30 microseconds from the 74.2 microseconds applicable to a thickness of 0.125 inch. This leads to the supposition that the time constant, while significant, is not a "sensitive" function when applied in equation (6). In view of the necessity to "average" many component skin thicknesses to arrive at a value for derivation of $T_m$ in the first place, this
result is fortuitous if, in fact, it holds in most cases. Additional experience in application of the revised ETCAL program will have to transpire for this to be confirmed, however.

The lower resistance seen for the armament power supply circuit (S.220) when compared to the position lamp circuit (L.050) although for stroke location 1 at the forward end of the tip fuel tank in each case, can be accounted for when one considers that the armament circuit does not extend the full length of the wing. It should be remembered that the value $R_w$ discussed here is the portion of the wing skin which serves as a return for the circuit.

It should be noted that $R_w$ is not defined as the d-c resistance of the structure but is an "effective" resistance instead, probably arising from a very complex combination of bonding and material resistivities themselves. No attempt has been made, as yet, to derive this "effective" resistance in terms of the d-c equivalents of these resistivities, yet it is possible to see some basic relationships between values of calculated $R_w$ and structural characteristics. The $R_w$ calculated for the position lamp circuit for a lightning current entering the wing tip fuel tank is 10 to 20 times greater than that calculated for a stroke entering on the wing itself. This clearly indicates that the joint resistance between the tank and the wing adds a component to the induced voltage only when the lightning current flows through it. The joint resistance shows up in $R_w$ derived by ETCAL accordingly, only when the lightning current must flow through this resistance. From table IIIa, the difference between $R_w$ derived for a stroke to the tank (2600 μohms) and that derived for a stroke to the wing tip (210 μohms) must be the effective resistance of the joint itself. This would say that the joint has a resistance, by itself, of:

$$2600 - 210 = 2390 \text{ μohms}.$$ 

These values, from table IIIa, were derived from measurements made at China Lake on a complete F89-J aircraft, with the measurements made at the circuit terminals in the cockpit. The earlier data from measurements made on the F89-J wing alone, from table IIIb, result in an effective joint resistance of:

$$700 - 70 = 630 \text{ μohms}.$$ 

Different values accrue from the corresponding slow wave data on the same table, but the general relationships are the same.
Therefore, the "joint" on the F89-J at China Lake might be supposed to have a resistance three or four times that of the same part of the wing assembly tested earlier at the High Voltage Laboratory in Pittsfield. This difference may be explainable by the normal variation in mechanical joint bonding resistances, from one assembly to another, even though of the same design. However, the differences also might be attributable to the added bonding resistance of the wing-to-fuselage joint included in the lightning current flow path at China Lake but obviously not included at the High Voltage Laboratory. This bolted joint might have been responsible for the additional resistance of

\[
\text{apparant joint } R_w \text{ at China Lake} - \text{apparant joint } R_w \text{ at HVL-Pittsfield} = (11)
\]

\[
(2390 \, \mu\text{ohms}) - (630 \, \mu\text{ohms}) = 1760 \, \mu\text{ohms}.
\]

Note that an even larger difference between corresponding values of M derived from the same two data sources exists, but this variation can be largely attributed to the inclusion of skin effect in the analysis of China Lake data. Study of equation (6) shows why this is so. With the factor \((1-e^{-lt})\) reducing the amplitude of \(i_L\) on the inside skin surfaces at any time \(t\), a correspondingly larger value of \(M\) must appear to provide the same induced voltage amplitude as would be obtained from an uncorrected expression, as in equation (1). ETCAL calculates \(R_w\) by the same method for either case so the inclusion of skin effect in the China Lake analysis will not affect the \(R_w\) derivations.

If the wing-to-fuselage joint in the complete aircraft does indeed contribute to an increased \(R_w\), then it follows that a lightning stroke flowing from the wing tip to fuselage, or to the opposite wing tip, would induce higher voltages in this and other circuits running from the wing to the fuselage where the measurements were made, as compared with measurements made on the same circuits at the wing root only. This was, in fact, the case in most instances where comparisons were made between China Lake data and earlier measurements on the F89-J wing alone.
SECTION II - A MATHEMATICAL MODELING TECHNIQUE FOR CALCULATING PROBABLE INDUCED VOLTAGES IN AIRCRAFT ELECTRICAL CIRCUITS

BASIC THEORY

Concurrently with the analysis of experimental data just described, work was begun during this program on development of a mathematical modeling technique to enable aircraft designers to calculate the probable magnitudes and waveshapes of lightning-induced voltages in proposed airframe and electrical circuit design and layout configurations. Such a tool would be very useful in enabling aircraft designers to anticipate the magnitude of the transfer functions associated with particular circuits and configurations associated with new aircraft designs, thereby permitting definition of the susceptibility of connected avionics and electric power system components to lightning-induced voltages. The need for protective measures can then be established.

For the purpose of this objective, a wing was chosen as the initial airframe to be modeled since a substantial amount of experimental data existed (ref. 1) against which to compare the accuracy of the model.

From equations (1) or (5), it is evident that if the transfer functions $R$ and $M$ for a particular circuit within an airframe are known, the voltage $e_{oc}$ in the circuit can be calculated for any assumed lightning current waveform, $i_L(t)$.

Due to the fast rise and decay and short time duration of most lightning stroke currents, nearly all of this current will flow in the outer skins of metallic airframes rather than through internal spars and ribs, etc. Assuming that this is so, and also that the current flows uniformly in a lineal direction through a structure, its skin can be represented by a very large number, $n$, of infinitely small parallel current filaments. For an aircraft wing, this representation would be as shown in figure 9.

Assuming that the wing circuit pictured in figure 9 is "grounded" to the airframe at the outboard end of the wing, the voltage appearing between the inboard end of the conductor and the inboard airframe is equal to the line integral of voltage induced around a plane such as ABCD in figure 9.
If lightning current flows on the wing skin and the skin has a finite resistance, then a resistive voltage drop will appear along CD and contribute to the total voltage along path ABCD. If \( i_L \) represents the entire lightning current, presumed to be equally distributed among all filaments, then the resistive voltage drop included along path CD is given by:

\[
e_R = \frac{i_L}{n} R_n
\]  

In (12), \( R_n \) is the resistance of one current filament, equal to \( n \) times the total wing skin resistance, outboard to inboard.

The magnetically induced voltage is, by Faraday's Law, (ref. 3) equal to the time rate of decrease of the total magnetic flux linking the circuit. This is expressed as:

\[
e_m = -\frac{d\phi}{dt}
\]  

where

- \( e \) = total EMF (volts)
- \( \phi \) = total flux (webers)
- \( t \) = time (seconds)
If the voltage around the inboard circumference of the wing in figure 9 is assumed to be the same at all points, the voltage between the circuit conductor at A and the inboard circumference will also be the same at any point. Thus, the magnetic flux lines linking all planes defined by the particular wing circuit conductor (AB) and any longitudinal wing intersect will be equal. For purposes of calculation, it is convenient to choose a plane along the axis of symmetry (if available).

The portion of the magnetic flux passing through the plane ABCD generated by each of the skin current filaments must be determined and the total summarized in order to determine the magnetically induced voltage, \( e_m \) as defined in equation (13).

The magnetic flux density produced at some point, \( p \), with respect to a current filament is defined by the Biot-Savart Law (5) as:

\[
B = \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \int \frac{\sin \theta}{r^2} \, dl
\]

(14)

where

\( I = \) current (amperes)

\( B = \) magnetic flux density (webers per meter\(^2\))

\( l, r = \) dimensions in meters

\( \mu = \) permeability of the medium (for air = \( 4\pi \times 10^{-7} \) henrys per meter)

The total flux, \( \phi_n \), passing through a given area is equal to the product of the area and the component of \( B \) normal to it. Thus,
\[ \varphi_n = \int \int B \cdot ds \]  \hspace{1cm} (15)

where

\[ \varphi_n = \text{magnetic flux (webers) contributed by each skin current filament} \]

In the wing circuit problem, the flux density, \( B \), must be determined as a function of the current \( i_n \) and applicable geometry for each current filament along the wing skin, and integrated over the surface area defined by the plane ABCD, in accordance with equation (15).

Since the assumption has been made, for the present, that the total lightning current, \( i_L \), is evenly distributed among the \( n \) skin current filaments, the voltage \( e_m \) can be written:

\[ e_m = - \sum_{n=1}^{n=n} \frac{d\varphi_n}{dt} = - \frac{di_L}{dt} \sum_{n=1}^{n=n} M_n \]  \hspace{1cm} (16)

where \( M \) is expressed in henries and \( i_L \) in amperes. Since \( e_m \) is related to \( di_L/dt \) by the function,

\[ - \sum_{n=1}^{n=n} M_n = M \]  \hspace{1cm} (17)

\( M \) operates as a transfer function expressing the magnetic-induced voltage in terms of the skin (lightning) current.

**Computer Program**

To calculate \( M \) for various wing geometries and circuit conductor positions, a computer program (WING) in BASIC language for use on the General Electric time-sharing computer system has been written. This program also calculates the resistive transfer function \( R_s \) based on skin dimensions and resistivity.

The computer program calculates the flux density, \( B \), per ampere of lightning current, and the number of flux lines (webers) which link the plane ABCD from each individual skin current filament. The program performs the calculation of expression (18) for
the flux density, \( B \), and the expression (19) for total flux lines, as follows:

\[
B(r, l) = \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \left[ \frac{l}{\sqrt{l^2 + r^2}} + \frac{L - l}{r \sqrt{(L-l)^2 + r^2}} \right] \quad (18)
\]

\[
\psi = \frac{\mu I}{2\pi} \left[ \sqrt{D^2 + l^2} + L \log \frac{\sqrt{D^2 + L^2} - L}{D} \right]_{D=D_2}^{D=D_1} \quad (19)
\]

where

\[
\psi = \text{magnetic flux (webers)}
\]

\( D, L, l \) and \( r \) = dimensions in meters, as shown in figure 10.

FIGURE 10 - DEFINITION OF DIMENSIONS OF EQUATIONS (18) and (19)

The program divides each equation by the lightning current to calculate the inductive transfer function, \( M \), and the flux density, \( B \), per ampere of lightning current.
The derivation of equations (18) and (19) from the Biot-Savart Law of equation (14) in terms of the definitions of figure 10 is presented in Appendix 1 of this report.

The computer program WING calculates the flux linking plane ABCD of figure 9 per ampere of skin current from each skin current filament by first calculating the distances of lines AB and CD from the filament, and identifying these as $D_1$ and $D_2$, respectively. Equation (19) is then solved for $D=D_1$ and for $D=D_2$ and the difference taken to achieve the flux passing between $D_1$ and $D_2$, which is, in fact, flux passing through the plane ABCD, as shown in the cross-sectional view of figure 11.

![Cross-sectional view of wing leading edge showing distances utilized in calculation of magnetic flux passing through plane ABCD by equation (19)](image)

In figure 11 it is clear that the flux passing through ABCD generated by the skin current filament is equal to the flux, $\psi_1$, surrounding the filament out to a radius $D_1$ minus the flux, $\psi_2$, surrounding the filament out to $D_2$. Since all of this flux is generated by the same fraction of lightning current, $(i_L/n)$, it follows that the fluxes $\psi_1$ and $\psi_2$ can be divided by $(i_L/n)$ to obtain the corresponding inductive transfer function, $M_n$ in henries, as follows:

$$M_n = \frac{\psi}{(i_L/n)}$$

(20)
In WING $1$ is designated M8 and $2$ is designated M7. The program proceeds to calculate the flux passing through ABCD from each skin current filament. This contribution is given by

$$M_{ABCD} = (M7 - M8)$$  \hspace{1cm} (21)

for each filament. It sums these quantities and the total is equal to the inductive transfer function between the wing and the conductor AB with airframe return. It designates this function M, with dimensions in henrys. M is, of course, purely a function of geometry and, therefore, not dependent on the amplitude of lightning current.

The flux density, B, is indeed a function of lightning current amplitude as well as geometry. It is calculated in accordance with equation (18) and, since it is not identical along the entire length, L, of the conductor AB, the program computes it for a point at the middle of L (half way down the wing). A slight program modification would permit it to be calculated for any other point along AB.

The program WING is presented in figure 12, and a flow diagram is presented in figure 13. Two subroutines are utilized in the program. "Subroutine 1200" calculates M and "subrouting 1000" calculates B. The wing geometry and other data required are listed at the head of the program. The geometrical quantities are defined by figure 14. Normally, the number of skin conductors required to reach a stable solution is sufficient when J is set equal to 1 centimeter, for a structure the size of an aircraft wing. More conductors may be required for accurate solutions near the leading and trailing edges, and in these cases values of J of 0.1 or 0.01 centimeters would probably provide authentic solutions. When the spacing between the circuit conductor AB and the inside of the wing becomes of the same order of magnitude as the spacing between skin filament conductors, the solutions calculated by the program are not considered authentic.

**COMPARISON WITH MEASURED DATA**

The program, WING, was used to calculate the transfer inductance, M, and the flux density, B, for aircraft circuit conductors assumed to be located at various positions on the horizontal axis of an F89-J wing. These calculations were made in the hopes that some idea of the authenticity of WING could be obtained by comparing the transfer functions calculated by WING with those
FIGURE 12 - COMPUTER PROGRAM "WING" IN BASIC LANGUAGE FOR GE TIME SHARING COMPUTER SYSTEM (Continued next page)
195    G0 SUB 1000
196    LET R2=R1*SIN(Z+(P1/2))
200    G0 SUR 1200
210    NEXT Ø
211    G0 T0 220
212    LET D2=SQRT(R+R+2*R*2-2*R*R*COS(Ø))
214    LET X=(P1/2)-(Ø/2)
216    LET D1=SQRT((R+(C-X1))+(P+D2)^2+2*(R+(C-X1))*D2*COS(X))
217    G0 T0 195
220    FOR E=(J/2) T0 (C-(J/2)) STEP J
230    LET D1 = SQRT(R+2*(X1-E)^2)
240    LET D2=SQRT(R+2*(R+C-E)^2)
245    G0 SUB 1000
246    LET R2=-B1*((X1-E)/D1)
250    G0 SUB 1200
260    NEXT E
270    LET W=ATN(R/T)
280    FOR G=(J*COS(W))/2 T0 (J*COS(W)/2) STEP J*COS(W)
290    LET Y=G*(R/T)
300    LET D1=SQRT(Y+2*(X1+T-G)^2)
310    LET D2=SQRT(Y+(C+R+T-G)^2)
315    G0 SUB 1000
316    LET R2=-B1*((X1+T-G)/D1)
320    G0 SUR 1200
330    NEXT G
340    LET A=S1*(P1*R+2*C+2*SQRT(T+R+2))
350    LET R2=R1*(L/A)
360    PRINT "X1="X1;"M="M1;"R2="R2
365    PRINT "R="B3
370    G0 T0 1330
1000   LET B1=(.002/N*)((L/2)/(D1*SQRT((L/2)^2+D1+2)))*2
1010   RETURN
1200   LET M1=(.002/N)*SQRT(D1^2+L^2)+L*LOG(SQRT(D1^2+L^2)-L)-LOG(D1))
1220   LET M3=(-.002/N)*D1
1230   LET M4=(.002/N)*SQRT(D2^2+L^2)
1240   LET M5=(-.002/N)*L*LOG(SQRT(D2^2+L^2)+L)-LOG(D2))
1250   LET M6=-(.002/N)*D2
1260   LET M7=M1+M3
1270   LET M8=M4+M5+M6
1280   LET M=M+2*(M7+M8)
1282   LET B3=B3+2*B2
1290   RETURN
1300   DATA
1310   DATA
1330   END

FIGURE 12 - Continued
FIGURE 13 - FLOW DIAGRAM OF COMPUTER PROGRAM, WING, TO CALCULATE R AND M TRANSFER FUNCTIONS FOR AN AIRCRAFT WING
CALCULATE $D_1$ AND $D_2$ FOR FILAMENTS ON THE MAIN WING BOX

FOR $E = (J/2)$ TO $(C - J/2)$ STEP $R$

CALCULATE

$$D_1 = \sqrt{R^2 + (X_1 - E)^2}$$

CALCULATE

$$D_2 = \sqrt{R^2 + (R + C - E)^2}$$

GO TO SUBROUTINE 1000

RETURN FROM SUBROUTINE 1000

CALCULATE COMP. OF $B_1$
NORMAL TO PLANE ABCD

$$B_2 = -B_1 \frac{(X_1 - E)}{D_1}$$

GO TO SUBROUTINE 1200

RETURN FROM SUBROUTINE 1200

DOES

$E = (C - J/2)$?

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

FIGURE 13-(CONTINUED)
CALCULATE \( D_1 \) AND \( D_2 \) FOR FILAMENTS ON THE TRAILING EDGE

CALCULATE ANGLE \( \theta \) BY TRIG.

\[ W = \frac{(J \cos \theta)}{2} \text{ TO } T - \frac{(J \cos W)}{2} \text{ STEP } (J \cos W) \]

CALCULATE \( Y = \frac{G R}{T} \)

CALCULATE

\[ D_1 = \sqrt{y^2 + (x + T - g)^2} \]
\[ D_2 = \sqrt{y^2 + (C + R + T - g)^2} \]

GO TO SUBROUTINE 1000

RETURN FROM SUBROUTINE 1000

CALCULATE COMP OF \( B \) NORMAL TO PLANE ABCD

\[ B_2 = -\frac{B_1}{D_1} \quad (x_1 + T - g) \]

GO TO SUBROUTINE 1200

RETURN FROM SUBROUTINE 1200

DOES \( G + T - (J \cos W)/2 \) ?

NO

YES

CALCULATE CROSS-SECTIONAL AREA OF WING SKIN

\[ A = \frac{1}{2} \left[ 2TR + 2C + 2\sqrt{T^2 + R^2} \right] \]

CALCULATE WING RESISTANCE

\[ R_2 = R_1 \frac{L}{A} \]

PRINT \( X, M, R_2, B \)

END

FIGURE 13 - (CONTINUED)
WING (CONT'D)

SUBROUTINES

SUBROUTINE 1200

CALCULATE FLUX DENSITY, B
AT MID LENGTH OF AB

\[ B_1 = \left( \frac{0.002}{N} \right) \left( \frac{L/2}{D_1 \sqrt{(L/2)^2 + D_1^2}} \right)^2 \]

SUBROUTINE 1200

CALCULATE

\[ M_1 = (0.002/N) \left( \sqrt{D_1^2 + L^2} + L \log \left( \sqrt{D_1^2 + L^2} - L \right) - \log D_1 \right) \]

CALCULATE

\[ M_3 = (-0.002/N) D_1 \]

CALCULATE

\[ M_4 = (0.002/N) \left( \sqrt{D_2^2 + L^2} \right) \]

CALCULATE

\[ M_5 = (0.002/N) \left( -L \log \sqrt{D_2^2 + L^2} + L \log D_2 \right) \]

CALCULATE

\[ M_6 = (-0.002/N) D_2 \]

CALCULATE

\[ M_7 = M_1 + M_3 \]

CALCULATE

\[ M_8 = M_4 + M_5 + M_6 \]

CALCULATE

\[ M = M + 2(M_7 - M_8) \]

CALCULATE

\[ B_3 = B_3 + 2B_2 \]

FIGURE 13 - (CONTINUED)
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NOTES: 1. WING CROSS SECTION IS ASSUMED TO BE SYMMETRICAL ABOUT THE HORIZONTAL AXIS.

2. XI IS NEGATIVE IF CONDUCTOR IS PLACED AFT OF VERTICAL AXIS.

FIGURE 14 - GEOMETRICAL DATA ITEMS REQUIRED FOR WING COMPUTER PROGRAM
reduced from measured F89-J induced voltage data by ETCAL. Due to the basic geometrical definitions used in WING of figure 14, some simplification was necessary in the F89-J dimensions for input to the WING program. The F89-J wing is described in references 1 and 5. Basically, it is 680 centimeters long and tapers from about 46 centimeters down to about 15 centimeters thick at the center spar. Chord (less ailerons and flaps) distance tapers from 282 centimeters at the root to 193 centimeters at the tip. These dimensions were approximately averaged, after inspection of the wing, to determine the most realistic dimension inputs to WING.

The data inputs describing the modeled F89-J wing were:

\[
\begin{align*}
S_1 & \quad \text{(average skin thickness)} = 0.318 \text{ cm} \\
R_1 & \quad \text{(skin material resistivity for aluminum)} = 2.82 \times 10^{-6} \text{ ohm-cm} \\
T & \quad \text{(horizontal width of trailing edge)} = 107 \text{ cm} \\
C & \quad \text{(horizontal width of main wing box)} = 240 \text{ cm} \\
R & \quad \text{(leading edge radius)} = 20 \text{ cm}.
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 15 is a plot of the values of transfer inductance, M, and flux density, B, calculated by WING for circuit conductors located at various positions from leading to trailing edges. There is some question as to whether a significant portion of the lightning current actually flows along the ailerons and flaps as it does through the skin covering the main wing box and leading edges. In cruise flight, with ailerons and flaps in a near 0° position, the small gaps between ailerons and flaps may be arced over by the lightning current, providing a continuous path. In many other cases, however, this may not be so. Thus, the F89-J wing was modeled with and without the ailerons and flaps. When the program was run in the latter case, the dimension, T, was reduced to 1 centimeter (to avoid a discontinuity at T=0) and the aft spar was assumed to carry a proportionate amount of lightning current. Plots of M and B are presented in figure 15 for both cases. The transfer inductance, M, is plotted against the left scale which is in logarithmic increments. \(B\), the flux density, is plotted against the right scale which is linear about a zero line shown dashed across the figure.
Figure 15 - Calculated values of transfer inductance, M, and flux density, B, at conductor locations along the axis of symmetry of F89-J wing modelled by wing computer program.
Figure 15 shows that the value of the transfer inductance, $M$, varies from its lowest values (apparently approaching zero) near the leading and trailing edges, to a maximum near (but not at) the center of the wing box. The maximum transfer inductance calculated by WING is slightly more than 0.5 microhenry at locations around 100 centimeters from the aft main spar for this model, but the minimum is considerably less than this in regions more frequently utilized for running electrical circuits, such as the leading edge.

The resistance, $R$, is the same for all conductor locations since the entire airframe is involved as the return path for the circuit conductor, AB. This resistance only changes when the wing geometry changes, as when the ailerons and flaps are omitted from the model. The resistance values calculated were:

- $R$ (with ailerons and flaps included) = 7.9 microhms
- $R$ (without ailerons and flaps) = 10.35 microhms.

It is of interest to compare the values of $M$ of figure 15 with those calculated from measured data by ETGAL, as presented on table III.

Table III indicates values of 53.6 and 17.1 nanohenrys (microhenrys x $10^3$) for the position lamp circuit, which runs along the aft spar. For most of its travel it is on the inside (forward) of the spar, but opposite the flap it runs along the outside (aft) of the spar, slightly exposing it when the flap is down (flaps and ailerons were set about 20° for the China Lake tests during which the measured data were taken). The location of the position lamp circuit forward of the spar is believed within a few centimeters of the spar. This circuit employs the airframe as return. These values of $M$ fall within the range of transfer inductances calculated by WING for conductors within a few centimeters of the spar, when the flaps and ailerons were omitted from the model. This is logical since the amplitude of the driving voltage and currents generated by the aircraft transient analyzer is probably insufficient to cause sparking between flaps and ailerons, even if a full scale lightning flash could do so.

In the leading edge, circuit S.220 (armament power supply) listed in table III may be compared with the data presented in figure 15, but it must be remembered that this circuit is not "grounded" to the airframe at the wing tip, as is the position
lamp circuit, and the circuit AB utilized for derivation of the model (eq. 13, etc). The capacitive coupling between an un-grounded circuit adds a component of capacitive voltage to the line integral around loop ABCD in figure 9, which may be of opposite polarity to the inductive voltage and thus appear to reduce the effective transfer inductance, M, calculated by ETCAL for table III, since ETCAL, in its present form, does not separate capacitive and inductive voltage components and transfer functions, but considers all non-resistive voltages to be the result of inductive coupling only. Thus, ETCAL calculates an M of between 5 and 9 nanohenrys, but a circuit located in about the same region within the leading edge of the modeled wing will have in the neighborhood of 50 nanohenrys, from figure 15.

Unfortunately, no circuits existed through the center of the F89-J wing upon which suitable measurements could be made for comparison with the WING calculations of figure 15. WING calculates the maximum transfer inductance to be in this region, as shown in table III, and it would be of interest to obtain measurements on an unshielded circuit in this location utilizing the airframe as return, for comparison with the calculations which show maximum transfer inductances of around 500 nanohenrys (0.5 microhenry). Such a value is greater than the transfer inductance calculated for any circuit in this or other induced voltage measurement programs, but since most electrical wiring is installed in the leading or trailing edges of wings, no measurements have been made in "center" circuits.

The values of magnetic flux density, B, per ampere of lightning current are also shown in figure 15. These calculations are made for a point half way down the wing, since flux density also varies along the axis of a conductor, in a wing of finite length. It is noteworthy that B is zero at locations where the transfer inductance, M, is greatest. B, of course, describes flux density at a point, whereas M describes total flux throughout an area. Thus, there is no inconsistency in this result. Instead, the result is telling us that for M to be greatest, the conductor should be located in a region where B is lowest, or zero. This applies for circuits utilizing the airframe as return only. It is expected that circuits with independent, parallel return paths, such as parallel pair or twisted pair circuits, will experience the greatest magnetic coupling and induced voltages where the flux density, B, is greatest. This is because only the area between conductors of the pair is now of importance in equation (13). WING would show this if it were modified to
calculate flux between wires of a pair instead of between a single conductor and the airframe.

Practically speaking, these results lead to two fundamental conclusions of importance to circuit and airframe designers:

1. To minimize magnetically induced voltages in circuits utilizing the airframe as return, these circuits should be placed in the leading and trailing edges, as close to the wing skin as possible.

2. To minimize magnetically-induced voltages in circuits with independent return, or in multi-conductor circuits where the voltage between any of them must be minimized, the conductors should be placed at a location near the center of the wing, where $B$ is minimum.

Figure 15 shows that $B$ does not vary significantly within about 40 centimeters from the well rounded leading edge. The program calculates a finite value of about $22 \times 10^{-6}$ webers per square meter per ampere of lightning current in this region, and calculates a negative value of 5 times this level in the apex of the trailing edge (of ailerons and flaps). Here, the solution appears less stable and the validity of numbers less than 5 centimeters from the apex of the trailing edge is questionable.

The reader is reminded that all of the values of $B$ and $M$ plotted on figure 15, and the succeeding discussion are for conductor positions on the horizontal axis of symmetry only. These values should not be construed as valid for conductors very far above or below this axis. The flux density would be the same for equal distances above or below the axis, due to symmetry, but the degree of this variation is as yet unknown. WING can be extended to calculate $M$ and $B$ for all locations within the wing, and this should be done before WING is used in a thorough design analysis. It is not known if a similar result pertains, for example, when a conductor is placed near the top or bottom of the wing, as happens when the conductor is moved toward the leading or trailing edges. It is probable that $B$ does, in fact, increase above and below the point on the axis of symmetry where it is zero, but the degree of this increase is not known.

The resistive transfer functions of 7.9 and 10.35 microhms with and without the ailerons and flaps respectively, are much
lower than the values presented in table III from ETCAL reduc-
tions of induced voltages in the F89-J, by a factor of five or
more. This may be due to one or both of the following reasons:

1. The resistances calculated by WING are the d-c resis-
tances, whereas those calculated by ETCAL for table III are
effective resistances, which reflect skin effect. In the latter
case, the effective resistance appears higher because the light-
ning current has not thoroughly diffused itself throughout the
wing skin. While ETCAL has been modified to account for skin
effect in the magnetic voltage component, it does not yet do so
for the resistive component.

2. The resistance calculated by WING includes only the
skin resistance itself, and not any resistances attributable to
the tip tank joint or the wing root joint, or any other bonding
resistances. The table III data most appropriately comparable to
the WING calculations is for the position light circuit (L.050)
with lightning current delivered to the outboard leading edge.
The table IIIb data, for the wing only, is probably most compar-
able. \( R_w \) varies from 70 microhms for the 8.2 x 14 microsecond
waveform to 57.5 microhms for the slower 36 x 82 microsecond wave-
form. Thus, it appears to decrease as the waveforms become long-
er and more time is available for diffusion of lightning current
into the skin. If the time constant of diffusion throughout a
0.125 inch skin is in fact near 74.2 microseconds as given by
equation (8), then only a small percentage of the total skin
cross-sectional area is available for conduction by the time (at
crest = 36 \( \mu s \)) that the effective \( R_w \) is calculated by ETCAL for
the 36 x 82 microsecond waveform, as follows:

At \( t = 36 \mu s \),

\[
\frac{A_{\text{effective}}}{A_{\text{total}}} = (1-e^{-\frac{t}{T}}) \tag{22}
\]

\[
= (1-e^{-\frac{36}{74}})
\]

\[
= (1-e^{-\frac{1}{1.628}})
\]

\[
= (1-.614) = 0.386
\]

so the effective cross-sectional area is 38.6% of the total avail-
able area. Since resistance is inversely proportional to area,
this means that the d-c resistance calculated by WING should be

\[ R_{dc} = 0.386 \cdot (R_{\text{effective}}) \]

If \( R_{\text{effective}} \) is assumed to be the 57.5 microhms calculated by ETCAL for table IIIb, then the d-c resistance should be:

\[ R_{dc} = (0.386)(57.5 \, \text{microhms}) \]

\[ = 22.2 \, \text{microhms}. \]

This value is very close to the values of 10.35 and 7.9 microhms calculated by WING, when the simplifications utilized in the WING program are recalled.
CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

Two computer programs, ETCAL and WING have been developed to calculate the resistance and inductive transfer functions R and M from measured data or a drawing-board design model of an aircraft wing. The model program, WING, does not as yet account for design details such as openings, bonding or joint resistances, non-metallic materials or the presence of ribs and spars, etc. Yet, lightning current apparently flows almost entirely in the aircraft skins, and the F89-J wing from which comparison test data was measured is completely metallic (aluminum) and of relatively simple design. Thus, the inductive transfer functions calculated by WING compare favorably with those calculated from actual induced voltage measurements by ETCAL.

Using the transfer functions, R and M, the voltage induced in any wing electrical circuit for which equation (6) is valid can be calculated for any assumed lightning current amplitude and waveshape. This can be done with transfer functions generated from previous measured data by ETCAL or from a drawing board design as modeled by WING. A short computer program, ECAL (not to be confused with ETCAL) has been prepared (fig. 16) to calculate e(t) for all values of t for any combination of lightning current parameters and transfer functions, skin thickness and resistivity. ECAL is programmed to accept R and M values calculated directly from WING or ETCAL. Thus, it must (and does) factor in skin effect in calculating the voltage induced in a circuit, by equation (6). The reader is cautioned, therefore, not to regard the geometrically calculated M in WING as being the effective transfer inductance in inducing the magnetic voltage component in the circuit. It is only correct when utilized in equation (6) or ECAL. This is because skin effect prevents all of the lightning current from being "seen" from inside of the wing, as discussed in Section I.

The similarity of the transfer functions derived from the analytical wing model with those derived by ETCAL from actual induced voltage measurements on the F89-J points out that the voltages induced in this aircraft's circuits have primarily been due to magnetic flux existing legitimately within the aircraft structure as a result of its geometry and not due to leakage.

REM I4 = LIGHTNING AMPLITUDE COEFFICIENT (KILAMPERES)
REM A = FIRST LIGHTNING FORMULA EXPONENTIAL (1/MICROSECONDS)
REM B = SECOND " " " "
REM C = RECIPROCAL OF LIGHTNING CURRENT SKIN PENETRATION TIME CONSTANT (1/MICROSECONDS)
REM R = TRANSFER RESISTANCE, FROM (ETCAL) OR (WING) (OHMS)
REM M = TRANSFER INDUCTANCE, FROM (ETCAL) OR (WING) (HENRYS)
REM P = TIME DURATION OF DESIRED E(T) TABLE (MICROSECONDS)
REM T = TIME INCREMENTS FOR DESIRED E(T) TABLE "
REM SUGGEST THAT DATA ITEMS I4, A, B, AND C GO IN LINE 190 AND ITEMS R, M, P AND T GO IN 200 FOR EASY VARIATION.

READ I4, A, B, C, R, M, P, D
FOR T=0 TO P STEP D
LET I1=I4*(1E6)*((-A)*EXP(-A*T))+B*EXP(-B*T)+(A+C)*EXP((-A-C)*T))
LET I2=I4*(1E6)*(B+C)*EXP((-B-C)*T)
LET I3=I1-I2
LET E1=R*I4*(EXP(-A*T)-EXP(-B*T))*(1-EXP((-C)*T))
LET E2=M*I3
LET E=E1-E2
PRINT T, E
NEXT T
DATA
200 DATA
210 END

FIGURE 16 - COMPUTER PROGRAM, ECAL, TO COMPUTE LIGHTNING-INDUCED VOLTAGE FROM LIGHTNING CURRENT PARAMETERS AND TRANSFER FUNCTIONS R AND M
flux coming through openings in the structure from outside. This fact is significant. It implies that plugging up, alone, of electrical discontinuities in the airframe may not be sufficient to reduce the susceptibility of electrical circuits within to acceptable levels. Treatment, instead, of individual circuits themselves may be required; either by modifications in circuit geometry, return method, or conductor shielding. The latter options, of course, become the only ones available when airframe skins are non-metallic.

ETCAL analyses were performed only on the circuits listed in table III. Similar analyses would probably be successful on most of the other circuits measured during the China Lake tests; however, attempts to utilize ETCAL to derive valid transfer functions from measurements on more complex circuits in this and other aircraft sometimes fail. ETCAL, it will be remembered (ref. 1), is fundamentally a method of deriving the Thevenin equivalent open circuit voltage source for a two-terminal pair, and Thevenin's theorem states that this can be accomplished regardless of the complexity of the circuit beyond the terminals, so long as it consists of a combination of active sources and passive, linear circuit elements. In the derivation of ETCAL, however, discrete data values are picked from time-varying oscillograms, and the validity of the resulting R and M values calculated depends greatly upon selection of the correct data points, as described in reference 1. The analysis, for example, requires that the point where the measured induced voltage, $e_{oc}$, crosses the zero line (t axis) be identified. To date, this point has been identified on the fundamental induced voltage trace with normally valid results. Some induced voltages, however, begin with a high frequency oscillation, usually decaying very early to the fundamental voltage waveform. These high frequency oscillations also cross the t axis, however, and might be considered as valid data points for ETCAL. Because most of these oscillatory events are thought to be secondary "ringing" in the electrical circuit and therefore not a part of the true induced voltage, the intersects from these oscillations have correctly been overlooked in the ETCAL analysis. It is possible, however, that some circuits receive, as a part of the induced voltage described by equation (1), a high frequency oscillatory component or some other component tending to obscure proper extraction of data for a correct ETCAL analysis. Some characteristics of circuits in which this seems to occur include:
1. circuits a large portion of which are in exposed areas, such as the cockpit area;

2. circuits with parallel branches in several different parts of the airframe;

3. circuits with complex filter networks included;

4. some circuits with non-linear elements, such as relay cores or motor armatures, etc.

There are other circuits which, when tested with certain lightning current waveforms, do not generate induced voltages which cross the t axis at well defined points. This may result when one component of the voltage is much greater than the other (usually the resistive component is greater than the inductive in these cases) or when a substantial capacitive component must be added in series with the resistive and magnetic components.

In all of these cases, it is believed that proper utilization of ETCAL or a subsequent improvement thereof will eventually enable derivation of valid transfer functions for all circuits. Further detailed study of these peculiar cases must be undertaken, however, before the ETCAL-type analytical procedure will become clear.

The success of this initial attempt to calculate possible induced voltages, via transfer functions, in wing electrical circuits suggests that further development can provide a computerized model capable of predicting all of the induced voltage information required by aircraft designers for avoidance of susceptibility or development of adequate protective measures in the design stage. Even in its present form, WING should be useful to designers in comparing the possible susceptibility of various wiring layout options in conventional wing designs.

Refinements which should be made in WING include handling of:

1. tapered dimensions

2. non-metallic skin sections

3. conductors within conduits or shields

4. separate return circuits
5. access doors and other openings
6. spars and ribs
7. more precise geometrical description of the modeled wing
8. conductors above and below the axis of symmetry
9. conductors whose length is less than that of the entire wing
10. provision for unequal lightning current distributions and current concentration at stroke attachment points on the airframe.

Some of these refinements are simple. Others will require more analytical work and computer time, but all will eventually be possible. In a similar manner, programs can be developed for other elements of an aircraft and added, electrically, to WING to enable a complete lightning-EMC analysis to be performed on an aircraft design. As each refinement is developed, its results should, where possible, be compared with results obtained from measured data to assure its validity. A relatively large volume of induced voltage data already exists for this purpose from recent measurements on several aircraft utilizing the aircraft transient analyzer.

The increasing use of advanced, solid-state microelectronics in aircraft avionics, coupled with the utilization of multiplexed transmission techniques and central avionics integration systems makes adequate protection from lightning-induced voltages a must if mission reliability and flight safety are to be maintained. Future use of solid-state electric power control techniques (SOSTEL) may also require that greater protection against lightning-induced voltages be designed into aircraft electric power distribution systems than is now the case. It is hoped that the analytical tools described herein are made use of for this purpose. The computer programs described are available from NASA Aerospace Safety Research and Data Institute or General Electric for this purpose. The programs will be kept up-to-date by the addition of refinements as these are developed.
1. Derivation of Equations (18) and (19) of Section II.

For the calculation of magnetic flux density, $B$, at a point, $p$, at some distance $r$ from a current carrying wire of finite length, $L$, as shown in figure A1 below:

\[ \text{FIGURE A1} \]

the Biot-Savart equation (ref. 4) gives:

\[ B = \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \int_0^L \frac{\sin\theta}{r^2} \, dl \]  \hspace{1cm} (A1)

where

- $I = \text{current (amperes)}$
- $B = \text{flux density (webers per square meter)}$
- $L, r, \ell = \text{dimensions (meters)}$
- $\mu = \text{permeability (for air = } 4\pi \times 10^{-7} \text{ henrys per meter)}$

Expressing the $(\sin\theta)$ in terms of the geometry of figure A1, equation (A1) can be re-written:
\[ B = \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \int_{0}^{\ell} \frac{r}{\sqrt{(\ell-y)^2 + r^2}} - \frac{1}{(\ell-y)^2 + r^2} \, dy \quad \text{1st int.} \]

\[ + \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \int_{0}^{L} \frac{r}{\sqrt{(y-\ell)^2 + r^2}} - \frac{1}{(y-\ell)^2 + r^2} \, dy \quad \text{2nd int.} \]

The first integral of (A2) can be re-written as equation (A3) and integrated by basic integral No. 173, page 71 of reference 6 as follows:

\[ 1^{st} \text{ int.} = \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \int_{0}^{\ell} \frac{r}{(\ell^2 + y^2 - 2\ell y + r^2)^{3/2}} \, dy \quad \text{(A3)} \]

\[ = \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \left[ \frac{2r(2y-\ell)}{4\ell^2 - 4(r^2 + \ell^2)} \sqrt{y^2 - 2\ell y + r^2 + L^2} \right]_{0}^{L} \quad \text{(A4)} \]

\[ 1^{st} \text{ int.} = \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \left[ \frac{(y-\ell)}{r(y-\ell)^2 + r^2} \right]_{0}^{L} \quad \text{(A5)} \]

where, for the basic integral No. 173 of reference 6,

\[ a = 1, \quad b = -2\ell \quad \text{and} \quad c = (r^2 + \ell^2). \]

The second integral of (A2) can be re-written and solved in the same manner as the first integral, as follows:

\[ 2^{nd} \text{ int.} = \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \int_{0}^{L} \frac{r}{(y^2 - 2\ell y + \ell^2 + r^2)^{3/2}} \, dy \quad \text{(A6)} \]

\[ = \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \left[ \frac{(y-\ell)}{r \sqrt{(y-\ell)^2 + r^2}} \right]_{\ell}^{L} \quad \text{(A7)} \]

and it is seen that integral (A5) is evaluated along the y axis from the bottom of the wire at 0 in figure (A1) to \( \ell \), and integral (A7) is evaluated from \( \ell \) to the top of the wire at \( L \). This
integration gives \( B \) as a function of position in terms of \( \ell \) at \( r \) as follows:

\[
B(\ell, r) = \frac{\mu_0 I}{4\pi} \left[ \frac{\ell}{\sqrt{\ell^2 + r^2}} + \frac{(L-\ell)}{\sqrt{(L-\ell)^2 + r^2}} \right] \tag{A8}
\]

Equation (A8) is thus an expression for the flux density, \( B \), at some point at a distance from the current carrying wire. This is equation (18) in Section II of this report.

To find the total amount of flux, \( \psi \), generated by this current, passing through an area bounded by lines parallel to the wire and distances \( D_1 \) and \( D_2 \) from it, it is necessary to integrate \( B(\ell, r) \) over the area defined by these lines as shown below in figure A2.

For this purpose the surface integral,

\[
\psi = \iint B \cdot ds = \int_{D_1}^{D_2} \int_0^L B \cdot d\ell \, dr \tag{A9}
\]

is to be solved. Substituting (A8) in (A9) we have
\[
\psi = \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \int_{D_1}^{D_2} \int_0^L \frac{\ell}{r \sqrt{\ell^2 + r^2}} \, d\ell \, dr \tag{int. 1}
\]

\[
+ \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \int_{D_1}^{D_2} \int_0^L \frac{(L-\ell)}{r \sqrt{(L-\ell)^2 + r^2}} \, d\ell \, dr \tag{int. 2}
\]

Integrating first in the y direction from 0 to L, integral 1 of (A10) is solved by basic integral No.128 of page 67, reference 6, with

\[
x = L, \quad a = 1, \quad c = r^2 \quad \text{and} \quad n = 1
\]

as follows:

\[
\text{int. 1} = \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \int_{D_1}^{D_2} \left[ \frac{\sqrt{\ell^2 + r^2}}{r} \right]_0^L \, dr \tag{A11}
\]

Integral 2 of (A10) can be re-written,

\[
\text{int. 2} = \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \int_{D_1}^{D_2} \int_0^L \frac{L}{r \sqrt{\ell^2 - 2L\ell + L^2 + r^2}} \, d\ell \, dr \tag{int. 2a}
\]

\[
- \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \int_{D_1}^{D_2} \int_0^L \frac{\ell}{r \sqrt{\ell^2 - 2L\ell + L^2 + r^2}} \, d\ell \, dr \tag{int. 2b}
\]

(A12)

and integral 2 is now divided into integral 2a plus integral 2b, as shown above. Integral 2a is solved by basic integral No.162, page 70 of reference 6 with

\[
a = 1, \quad b = -2L, \quad c = (L^2 + r^2)
\]

as follows:

\[
\text{int. 2a} = \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \int_{D_1}^{D_2} \left[ \frac{L}{r} \log(2\ell - 2L + 2 \sqrt{\ell^2 - 2L\ell + L^2 + r^2}) \right]_0^L \, dr \tag{A13}
\]
Evaluating integral (A13) between limits of \( \ell = 0 \) and \( L \), equation (A13) becomes:

\[
\text{int. } 2a = \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \int_{D_1}^{D_2} \frac{L}{r} \log \left( 2\sqrt{L^2 - 2L^2 + L^2 + r^2} \right) dr
\]

\[
- \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \int_{D_1}^{D_2} \frac{L}{r} \log \left( -2L + 2\sqrt{L^2 + r^2} \right) dr
\]

Simplifying,

\[
\text{int. } 2a = \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \int_{D_1}^{D_2} \frac{L}{r} \left[ \log 2\sqrt{r^2} - \log(-2L + 2\sqrt{L^2 + r^2}) \right] dr
\]

or

\[
\text{int. } 2a = \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \int_{D_1}^{D_2} \frac{L}{r} \left[ \log 2r - \log(-2L + 2\sqrt{L^2 + r^2}) \right] dr
\]

or

\[
\text{int. } 2a = \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \int_{D_1}^{D_2} \frac{L}{r} \log \left( \frac{r}{\sqrt{L^2 + r^2} - L} \right) dr
\]

Integral 2b of (A12) is solved by basic integral No.164, page 70 of reference 6, with

\[
a = 1, \quad b = -2L, \quad c = L^2 + r^2
\]

\[
\text{int. } 2b = \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \int_{D_1}^{D_2} \frac{L^2}{r} \left[ \sqrt{\ell^2 - 2L\ell + L^2 + r^2} + \frac{2L}{2} \left( \log \left| 2\ell - 2L + \sqrt{\ell^2 - 2L\ell + L^2 + r^2} \right| \right) \right]_0^L dr
\]
Evaluating integral 2b between limits of 0 and L gives,

\[
\int. 2b = \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \int_0^L \left[ \frac{1}{r} + \frac{L}{r} \log 2r - \frac{1}{r} \sqrt{L^2 + r^2} \right. \\
- \frac{L}{r} \log \left( -2L + 2 \sqrt{L^2 + r^2} \right) \left. \right] \, dr
\]  
\text{(A19)}

Simplifying (A19) gives,

\[
\int. 2b = \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \int_0^L \left[ (1) - \frac{1}{r} \sqrt{L^2 + r^2} + \frac{L}{r} \left( \log \frac{2r}{-2L + 2 \sqrt{L^2 + r^2}} \right) \right] \, dr
\]  
\text{(A20)}

adding integral 2a and 2b by (A17) plus (A20) now gives integral 2 of (A10) as follows:

\[
\int. 2 = \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \int_0^L \left[ \frac{L}{r} \log \frac{r}{\sqrt{L^2 + r^2} - L} \right] \, dr
\]  
\text{(A21)}

\[
-\frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \int_0^L \left[ (1) - \frac{\sqrt{L^2 + r^2}}{r} + \frac{L}{r} \log \frac{r}{\sqrt{L^2 + r^2} - L} \right] \, dr
\]

Now, the equation for \( \psi \) can again be written from (A10) as

\[
\psi = \int. 1 + \int. 2
\]
\text{(A22)}

\[
= (A11) + (A21)
\]

Evaluating (A11) between 0 and L, combining with (A21) and simplifying gives:
Equation (A24) must now be integrated in the \( r \) direction from \( D_1 \) out to \( D_2 \) to achieve the entire magnetic flux passing through the area of interest as shown in figure A2. Equation (A24) can be re-written as:

\[
\psi = \frac{\mu I}{4\pi} \int_{D_1}^{D_2} \frac{2}{r} \left( \sqrt{L^2 + r^2} - \frac{r}{L} \right) \, dr
\]  

\[
(A25)
\]

The first term of this equation is integrated by basic integral No.121, page 66 of reference 6 where

\[ a = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad c = L^2, \]

from which,

\[
\psi = \frac{\mu I}{2\pi} \left[ \sqrt{r^2 + L^2} + L \cdot \log \frac{\sqrt{r^2 + L^2} - L}{r} \right]_{D_1}^{D_2}
\]

\[
(A26)
\]

where \( r \) is evaluated from \( D_1 \) to \( D_2 \). The variable \( D \) is substituted in (A26) for \( r \) to become equation (19) of Section II.
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