Issue 153
July 2025
Division of Technical Resources
Office of Research Facilities
National Institutes of Health
Technical News BULLETIN

Advanced Arc Flash Risk Reduction in Medium Voltage Systems

Introduction

An arc flash event in a medium voltage (MV) switchgear is a high-energy transient that can release extreme thermal radiation, molten metal, and pressure waves within milliseconds. These events pose a serious risk to personnel and equipment, especially in environments requiring high reliability and rapid recovery. Regulatory mandates such as OSHA 1910.269 and NFPA 70E require formal hazard assessments and effective strategies to limit incident energy exposure through protective system design.

Reducing arc flash incident energy is critical not only for regulatory compliance but also for safeguarding human life, preserving infrastructure, and ensuring uninterrupted operations in mission-critical systems. Traditional overcurrent protection methods—characterized by fixed time-current coordination and broad margin allowances—are frequently inadequate at clearing faults swiftly enough to limit arc energy. In contrast, modern mitigation strategies combine high-speed detection technologies, coordinated protective relaying, and embedded system analytics to significantly reduce both the incident energy level and the arc flash boundary.

Modern Arc Flash Mitigation Techniques

The technologies below are grouped by their principal function: (A) high-speed detection and clearing, (B) system integration and maintenance, and (C) passive/structural solutions to allow engineers to quickly identify which approaches best suit their risk-reduction goals and logistical constraints.

A. High-speed detection and clearing
   1) Arc flash detection relays (AFRs)[1] – Offer millisecond-level response via optical and current sensors, directly truncating arc duration and minimizing incident energy; ideal when fault currents exceed ~20 kA and reducing PPE categories (e.g., from Category 4 to 2) is paramount, though fiber-optic routing and higher capital cost must be weighed.
   2) Active arc quenching systems[1] – Divert fault current into a low-impedance path within 4–6 ms, collapsing the arc plasma and greatly reducing thermal and pressure damage; best suited for full retrofits in mission-critical or confined switchgear rooms, but introduce mechanical complexity and require regular maintenance.
   3) Current-limiting fuses[2] – Offer extremely low let-through energy (I^2t) and a simple, sacrificial design that requires no electronics, making them budget-friendly; however, coordination with downstream breakers can be challenging, and replacement after operation must be anticipated.

B. System integration and maintenance
   1) Zone-selective interlocking (ZSI)[2] – Enhances selectivity by allowing downstream breakers to trip first, blocking upstream devices unless needed; provides marginal delay (<5 ms) but requires a pilot wire or communication wiring and does not reduce incident energy as dramatically as AFRs.
   2) Differential protection schemes[2] – Enable sub-cycle detection (<8 ms) with precise zone isolation, especially effective for bus or transformer zones; however, high-impedance variants demand stabilizing resistors and complex settings, and low-impedance schemes necessitate high-accuracy current transformers.
   3) Maintenance mode/alternate relay settings[2] – Reduce relay pickup times for live-work scenarios (per NFPA 70E), cutting arc duration when personnel perform in-cubicle tasks; these "work-mode" settings carry higher nuisance-trip risk if not rigorously managed.
   4) Energy-reducing line-side isolation (ERLSI)[3] – Inserts a small fuse or isolating device upstream of the main breaker to suppress arc initiation, achieving 80-90% incident energy reduction; extra cubicle space and careful coordination (ensuring the isolator trips first) are prerequisites.

C. Passive/structural solutions
   1) Isolation barriers[3] – Mechanical dividers that prevent arc propagation between compartments, offering low-cost, low-maintenance containment; while they do not reduce energy at its origin, they effectively limit

multi-cubicle escalation and require only periodic inspection.

2) Vertical bus with barriers (VCBB)[4] – A vertical conducting bus (VCB) with internal barriers yields 20-40% lower incident energy than a horizontal conducting bus (HCB), per IEEE 1584-2018; optimal for new switchgear designs where achieving incident energy targets (e.g., < 1.2 cal/cm²) is essential, though retrofit into existing HCB layouts is often impractical.

Implementation Considerations

Each mitigation technique is most effective when integrated into a comprehensive protection strategy, ensuring that one method's limitations are compensated for by another's strengths. Combining ERLSI, AFRs, and ZSI, for instance, provides both passive containment and active mitigation. Practical implementation must account for system constraints such as available fault current, spatial limitations, retrofit viability, and coordination of protective devices.

Conclusion

Effective arc flash risk reduction requires a holistic strategy that melds robust structural containment, high-speed sensing, and adaptive relay protection to ensure incident energy remains below PPE thresholds. To implement this, begin with a comprehensive arc flash study per IEEE 1584 to identify high-risk locations and establish PPE requirements; then optimize relay settings (using zone-selective interlocking or differential schemes) and install high-speed interruption devices such as AFRs and ERLSI switches; retrofit existing switchgear with arc-quenching modules or mechanical barriers—or select arc-resistant designs for new installations—and reconfigure busbar layouts toward vertical orientation with barriers; finally, validate and maintain all systems through periodic testing and updated coordination studies, train maintenance personnel on NFPA 70E live-work procedures, document every setting, and revisit risk assessments whenever system changes occur to drive continuous improvement.

References

1. Kay, J. A., Arvola, J., & Manninen, M. (2024, September 16-19). *Do ARC mitigating systems really work?* [Conference paper]. 2024 IEEE IAS Petroleum and Chemical Industry Technical Conference (PCIC), Orland, FL, United States. https://doi.org/10.1109/PCIC47799.2024.10832356
2. Wester, C., Hartmann, W., Elliott, D., & Virost, D. (2024, September 16-19). *A comparison of protection-based arc flash mitigation techniques* [Conference paper.] 2024 IEEE IAS Petroleum and Chemical Industry Technical Conference (PCIC), Orland, FL, United States. https://doi.org/10.1109/PCIC47799.2024.10832256
3. Carne, C., Brown, W. A., Clark, H. H., & McConnell, M. (2024). Comparison of low-voltage arc-resistant equipment, equipment with isolation barriers, and equipment with energy-reducing line-side isolation for reduction of arc-flash hazards. *IEEE Transactions on Industry Applications*, *60*(5), 7930-7939. https://doi.org/10.1109/TIA.2024.3409522
4. Pillay, U., Khan, M. F., & Behari, S. (2025, January 29-30). *Proactive arc flash mitigation in MV and LV electrical systems: Evaluating protection coordination, modern detection systems, and busbar configuration on arc flash incident energy levels* [Conference paper]. 2025 33rd Southern African Universities Power Engineering Conference (SAUPEC), Pretoria, South Africa. https://doi.org/10.1109/SAUPEC65723.2025.10944337