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Abstract — EMC and lightning protection analyses of large power systems require the knowledge of the dynamic behavior of extended grounding systems. They cannot be regarded as equipotential planes, but must be treated as coupling paths for transient overvoltages. This contribution presents a model for linear earth conductors based on the transmission line approach and outlines its integration in the transients program EMTP. Validation of the presented model is achieved by comparison with field measurements and with a rigorous electromagnetic model. Overvoltages and electrical fields throughout electrical power systems thus can be computed.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Grounding systems serve two purposes: Firstly, their task is to disperse fault currents into the earth, which can be evoked either by internal, unbalanced faults or by external sources, such as lightning. Secondly, extended grounding systems create a reference potential for all electrical and electronic apparatus making up a large-scale system. Local inequalities of this reference potential and disturbances conducted across the grounding system reportedly are a source of malfunction and destruction of components in electrical connection with the grounding system. This contribution treats grounding systems from the point of view of the electromagnetic compatibility (EMC) and thus regards a grounding system as a path of coupling between a source of interference, usually being an impressed fault or lightning current, and a consequence, typically a transient overvoltage or field stress, at the location of a disturbed object.

Since in most cases EMC studies require the knowledge of the system's performance over a wide frequency range, the presented methodology extends the range of validity of the well-known models for grounding systems towards higher frequencies in the order of magnitude of some megahertz. An approach could be based on the three basic concepts developed thus far. These are:

— The Network Approach, which models an earth conductor as equivalent π-circuits made up of lumped R-L-C elements. The coupling of earth conductors can be taken into account by mutually coupled inductances. Among others, Velazquez and Mukhedkar describe the procedure [1].

— The Transmission Line Approach was brought to practical applicability by Sunde [2]. The topology of the network of interconnected linear ground conductors is treated by the travelling wave technique pioneered by Bergeron. Nowadays, Papalexopoulos and Meliopoulos are basing their work on this method (e.g., [3]).

— The Electromagnetic Field Approach exhibits the most rigorous theoretical background of all three approaches. Strictly based on the theorems of electromagnetism and with the least neglects possible, the problems are defined in terms of retarded potentials, and among the possible strategies for their solution, the method of moments proved to be most efficient. Dawalibi could translate the highly complex relationships into practical, engineering programs [4].

For a model valid in the envisaged frequency range, the network approach was assumed not to be appropriate. In contrast, this contribution shall point out that the transmission line approach is a suitable and practical choice for the determination of both the transient ground potential rise and the electric fields in the vicinity of the grounding system. An existing program based on the electromagnetic field approach could validate this statement.

A brief review of Sunde's transmission line theory and the evaluation of the transmission line characteristics for common earth electrodes introduces this paper, followed by the description of an interface to the ATP version [5] of the wide-spread Electromagnetic Transients Program (EMTP) [6]. A post processor which computes electric fields in the soil from the current distribution in the
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grounding system is sketched next, preceding the presentation of field measurements and of comparisons with a rigorous electromagnetic model. Finally, a lightning protection study for a 123 kV substation underlines the great advantage of not having just a stand-alone grounding systems program, but a tool capable of analyzing specific grounding systems in conjunction with the entire electrical system.

![Diagram](image)

**Fig. 1. Horizontal earth electrode and transition to an equivalent transmission line segment**

**II. TRANSMISSION LINE MODEL FOR BURIED CONDUCTORS**

Fig. 1 illustrates the transition from a linear earth electrode to an equivalent transmission line with complex-valued, frequency dependent parameters \( Z'(\omega) \) and \( Y'(\omega) \), which denote the characteristic impedance and propagation function, respectively:

\[
Z'(\omega) = \frac{Z'(\omega)}{2\pi} \log \frac{1.85}{\sqrt{\gamma'(\omega) + \gamma(\omega)}}
\]

\[
Y'(\omega) = Y'(\omega) \cdot \frac{1}{\gamma'(\omega) + \gamma(\omega)}
\]

The angular frequency, \( \omega = 2\pi f \), uses \( f \) in Hz (\( j = \sqrt{-1} \)). This form corresponds to any two-conductor transmission line. Sunde derived equivalent expressions for a single conductor in contact to the soil, with the current returning through the earth. Both the longitudinal impedance per unit length, \( Z_I' \), and the transversal admittance per unit length, \( Y_I' \), of a horizontal conductor consist of an internal term and an earth return term in the following manner [2]:

\[
Z_I'' = Z_I' + \frac{j\omega\mu_0}{2\pi} \log \frac{1.85}{\sqrt{\gamma'' + \gamma'(\omega)}}
\]

\[
Y_I'' = Y_I' \cdot \frac{1}{\gamma'(\omega) + \gamma(\omega)} \cdot \log \frac{1.12}{\gamma'(\omega) + \gamma(\omega)}
\]

Here, \( Z_I'' \) denotes the internal impedance of a conductor of radius, \( a \), buried at a depth, \( z \), which is mainly governed by the skin effect, whereas \( Y_I'' \) stands for the insulation admittance of an eventual coating, through which the conductor is in contact to the surrounding medium. The latter is characterized by the earth's conductivity, \( \sigma_E \), relative permeability, \( \mu_r \), and permittivity, \( \varepsilon_r \). All three lead to a propagation function, which would govern the transmission of impulses along the conductor if it were imbedded in a homogeneous soil with these parameters. Plumey, Kouteznyikoff et al. derived analogous expressions for vertical ground rods [6], reading

\[
\Gamma(\omega) = \sqrt{j\omega\mu_0 \cdot (\sigma_E + j\omega\sigma_0 \varepsilon_r)}
\]

Equation (2) together with (3) and (4) leads to a complex-valued, transcendent equation for the propagation function

\[
\Gamma = \sqrt{Z'(\omega) \cdot Y'(\omega)}
\]

which is repeatedly solved for all frequencies under investigation by means of a standard IMSL routine [8,9].

Fig. 2 shows the resulting quantities as functions of frequency for a variety of soil parameters \( \sigma_E \) and \( \varepsilon_\varepsilon \). It is
common engineering practice to express the propagation function in terms of transfer function, \( H = \exp(-\gamma \ell) \), or attenuation per unit length, \( h' \), and phase velocity, \( c_p \):

\[
h'(\omega) = \frac{20 \text{ dB}}{\ell} \cdot \log|H(\omega)| \approx -8.686 \text{ dB} \cdot \text{Re}\left\{\gamma(\omega)\right\}
\]

(9)

\[
c_p(\omega) = \frac{\omega}{\text{Im}\left\{\gamma(\omega)\right\}}
\]

(10)

Only for lower frequencies, the properties of the ground are exclusively determined by the conductivity of the earth. Above some tens of kilohertz, its dielectric nature has to be taken into account.

### III. USAGE OF EMTP FOR GROUNDING SYSTEM ANALYSIS

Once the characteristic impedance and the transfer function of linear earth conductors are known, any kind of extended grounding system can be modelled by a network of transmission line segments, provided that inductive and capacitive coupling between the different line segments can be neglected. At first sight, it is not evident that this assumption is permissible, but the purpose of this contribution is to show that for the grounding systems analyzed thus far, the resulting error is within acceptable limits. From an engineering point of view, the gained versatility and flexibility in modelling an actual earthing system together with live parts of the installation compensates the loss in accuracy.

**A. Interface of the Ground Conductor Model to EMTP**

Live and earthed parts of the electrical system are modelled by the Electromagnetic Transients Program. EMTP incorporates Bergeron's method for transmission lines, i.e. replacing the line by Thevenin equivalent circuits at both terminals, consisting of the constant and real-valued characteristic impedance and a current source for the history of the travelling waves with the travel time \( \tau \) (Fig. 3, upper index/sign for forward travelling wave, lower index/sign for backward travelling wave):

\[
i_k^\text{hist} (t) = \frac{1}{Z_c} \cdot V_k (t-\tau) \pm i_k(t-\tau)
\]

(11)

In the frequency domain, the transition to complex-valued, frequency-dependent parameters necessary for earth conductors is simply,

\[
i_k^\text{hist} H = H^{-1} (Z_c^{-1} \cdot V_k \pm I_k)
\]

(12)
B. Modelling the Soil Ionization with EMTP

but since EMTP works in the time domain, the back transformation leads to two nested convolution integrals:

\[ i_{\text{transmitted}}(t) = h_0(t) \ast \left[ \log_{\Delta} \left( \frac{Z_{\text{eff}}(\omega)}{Z_0} \right) \ast v_0(t) \pm i_k(t) \right] \quad (13) \]

The numerical effort for the convolutions can be reduced drastically if the technique of the so-called recursive convolution can be applied [10]. For this purpose, it is necessary to approximate the characteristic impedance and the transfer function by rational functions, i.e. it is mandatory to identify their poles and zeroes. Marti's original strategy ([11], Fig. 4-a) of proceeding form lower to higher frequencies in a log-log-chart and placing a pole or zero wherever an asymptotic approximation leaves a tolerance strip of width \( 2\Delta \) is not adequate in the present case: In contrast to its original field of application, observed frequency, characteristic impedance and attenuation cover several orders of magnitude, and thus frequently cause numerical errors (Fig. 4-b).

A remedy could be found by the introduction of a relative error criterion for the tolerance strip and by the possibility of placing closely adjacent pole/zero-pairs in order to jump exactly on the target function ([12], Fig. 4-c).

A. Computation of the Electric Field Distribution

Considering the possibility to extend the application of the developed model to EMC-studies, the electric current vector is chosen as a key quantity. The main reason for this is the well known fact that in the general case the voltage between points along specified path is not equal to the potential difference, but is defined as a line integral of the electric field vector along the path. In order to compute the electric field distribution in the vicinity of the grounding system, a post processor to EMTP has been developed. Since the grounding system is modelled as a
network of arbitrarily connected or disconnected straight thin conductors, the electric field can be computed as a superposition of the contributions of field-generating currents on all straight conductors, which are readily available as EMTP results.

Usually, in order to avoid complications in the solution, only the electric charge distribution in the grounding system conductors is considered as a source of the electric field. This is equivalent to consider only the leakage currents from the conductors in the evaluation of the time-varying longitudinal current in the ground conductors as an additional source of the electric field. But it has been shown [17] that such simplification can lead to extremely wrong results in the computation of voltages. The procedure used here takes into account both components of the electric field, due to the electric charges and longitudinal current distribution in all the ground conductors.

In this study, a frequency-domain approach is used, i.e. fields are computed from the steady-state current distribution for \( f = 0 \ldots 1 \) MHz. This yields the transfer function for the electric field at prescribed observation points in the vicinity of the grounding system. Such transfer functions subsequently can be Fourier transformed to obtain the time-domain response.

Grounding conductors are divided in a number of smaller segments in the EMTP and the longitudinal currents are determined only in the end or junction points of the segments. The current in all other points can be determined by interpolation. Among the many choices for the interpolating function, one is exceptionally attractive for \( \text{OUT} \) purposes: the so called piecewise sinusoidal approximation of the current distribution \( I(t) \) that can be expressed by:

\[
I(\ell) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} P_k(\ell) \left[ I_k^+ \sinh \left( \frac{\Gamma \ell_k^-}{d_k} \right) + I_k^- \sinh \left( \frac{\Gamma \ell_k^+}{d_k} \right) \right]
\]

(18)

\( \Gamma \) is explained above (5), and \( P_k(\ell) \) are unit pulse functions with the values

\[
P_k(\ell) = \begin{cases} 
1, & \ell_k^- \leq \ell \leq \ell_k^+ \\
0, & \text{elsewhere}
\end{cases}
\]

(19)

Here, \( \ell \) denote points along the axis of the conductors, \( \ell_k^- \) is the first, \( \ell_k^+ \) is the second end point and \( d_k \) is the length of the \( k \)-th segment. \( I_{k}\) and \( I_{k}^+ \) are current phasors at the first and the second end point of the \( k \)-th segment, respectively.

The main reason for the approximation of the current with sinusoidal functions on the segments (18) is to exploit their properties revealed by Schelkunoff [18]. The sinusoidal line current source is probably the only finite source with simple and exact closed form expressions for the near fields [19]. In this study, the influence of the interface between the air and the earth is taken into account approximately by the modified image theory [16].

By this way the electric field at a point in the earth due to the sinusoidal sources on the \( k \)-th segment is obtained by superposition of the field of the original and image sinusoidal sources both placed in the unbounded conducting medium. The exact expressions for the electric field in a local cylindrical coordinate system illustrated in Fig. 6, due to the current distribution given in (18) on the \( k \)-th segment at a near point are:

\[
E_{k\ell} = \frac{\eta}{4 \pi \rho \sinh (\Gamma d_k)} \left[ I_k^+ e^{-\Gamma \ell_k^-} - I_k^- e^{-\Gamma \ell_k^+} \right] \sinh (\Gamma d_k) + \left( I_k^+ \cosh (\Gamma d_k) - I_k^- \cosh (\Gamma d_k) \right) e^{-\Gamma \ell_k^+} \cos \theta_1 + \left( I_k^+ \cosh (\Gamma d_k) - I_k^- \cosh (\Gamma d_k) \right) e^{-\Gamma \ell_k^-} \cos \theta_2
\]

\[
E_{k\ell} = \frac{\eta}{4 \pi \sinh (\Gamma d_k)} \left[ I_k^+ - I_k^- \cosh (\Gamma d_k) \right] e^{-\Gamma \ell_k^+} \frac{1}{R_2} + \left( I_k^+ - I_k^- \cosh (\Gamma d_k) \right) e^{-\Gamma \ell_k^-} \frac{1}{R_1}
\]

(20)

where \( \eta \) is the intrinsic impedance of the medium:

\[
\eta = \frac{j \omega \mu_0}{\sqrt{j \omega \varepsilon_{r,E} - \sigma_E}}
\]

(21)

The various geometrical quantities are illustrated in Fig. 6. The references concerning the derivation of (20) can be found elsewhere [19].

A brief description of the steps involved in the derivation are included in the Appendix for completeness.

V. VERIFICATION AND APPLICATION

A. Comparison with Field Measurements by EDF

The Direction des Études et Recherches of the Électricité de France granted an insight in their recordings of extensive field measurements performed in the mid-80's [20]. Impulse currents with front times down to 0.2 \( \mu \)s have been fed into single- and multi-conductor earthing arrangements as used industrially. The resulting
transient ground potential rise has been measured by means of a 60 m long ohmic divider, still having a measuring bandwidth of 3 MHz.

Fig. 7 shows the oscillograms of voltage and current as recorded on a ground rod (steel, 20 mm in diameter, other parameters in the figure). Included in the figure is the simulation result of the voltage when a current according to the measured one is impressed in the corresponding transmission line segment. The peak of the measured voltage curve is always higher than the corresponding value of the simulation, which can be explained by some remaining inductive voltage drop during the wave front along the divider added to the actual potential rise at the clamp of the ground rod.

The effective grounding impedance (Fig. 8) has been determined by a division of the Fast Fourier Transforms of measured voltage and current on a 10 m long horizontal ground wire made of copper alloy. The corresponding simulation curve has been generated by EMTP's frequency scan option, requesting a repeated set of phasor solutions of the simulation network. The curves show good agreement up to frequencies of 1 MHz, the underestimation at higher frequencies may be explained by the above-mentioned effect.

More complex grounding arrangements have been studied, too. Fig. 9 depicts the results in time domain of a tower footing, consisting of a set of four ground rods and two square loops (6 m x 6 m) in 1 m and 4 m depth, respectively. Except for a 200 ms long period during the wave front, the agreement between measurement and simulation is satisfactory.

B. Comparison with a Rigorous Electromagnetic Model

As an example, a grid-type grounding system of 10 m x 10 m with 3 x 3 meshes has been studied. A sinusoidal current of 1 kA and variable frequency is fed into the slightly asymmetric arrangement at its center \((xy) = (5 m, 5 m)\), the first regular mesh branch being reached at \((xy) = (5 m, 6.67 m)\). The conductors have a diameter of 10 mm, are assumed to be of ideal conductivity and are buried at a depth of 0.5 m in a soil with \(\sigma_E = 0.01 \text{ (Qm}^{-1})\) and \(\varepsilon_r E = 1\).

Since the local distribution of longitudinal and leakage currents within the grounding system is only an intermediate quantity in the computation of touch and step voltages above the grounding system, a comparison of the resulting electric fields at the earth's surface has been performed. Firstly, the current distribution in the grounding system according to the transmission line approach outlined above has been taken as input to the post processor described in section IV. The resulting field distribution is compared to a second, independent computation according to the rigorous electromagnetic approach developed by the second author [21]. The results are compared in Fig. 10.

The transmission line model slightly overestimates the results of the rigorous model, which is taken as a reference here. But still the interesting phenomena are modelled correctly, and the results are obtained within a fraction of the computation time required for the rigorous approach.
C. Lightning Protection study for a 123 kV substation

This application example sketches the procedure and results of a lightning protection study for a 123 kV substation. The lightning is assumed to hit the third tower of an overhead line (Fig. 11) and should have a crest value of 200 kA and an impulse shape as recommended in [22]. The EMTP data deck for the two-system, three-phase overhead line as well as the representation of the switchyard (voltage transformers, surge arresters, busbars and power transformer) has been made available by a CIGRE working group [B]. It has been combined with a detailed description of the tower footings and the meshed grounding system of the switchyard (70 m x 50 m) by means of the transmission line model.

Fig. 11. Lightning-struck overhead line entering 123 kV substation

for I = 200 kA:
- - - - tower #1
- - - - tower #2
- - - - tower #3
- - - - tower #4
- - - - tower #5

Fig. 12. Voltages and currents across insulators, and conductor potential at towers #1...#5 for phase A.
VI. CONCLUSION

Lightning protection and EMC analyses of power electric systems paying special attention to the grounding conditions require the knowledge of the dynamic properties of ground conductors and extended earthing systems. For this purpose, a methodology has been developed which is based on a transmission line approach for linear ground conductors. Thus, it is possible to integrate the grounding system as a network of such conductors into EMTP. The necessary interface algorithm has been outlined as well as a post processor capable of deriving electrical fields in the vicinity of the grounding system. Validation of the method developed by the first author could be achieved by means of comparisons with field measurements by the EDF at Paris, France, and with computational results produced by the second author's code based on a rigorous electromagnetic field approach. As an example, some aspects of a lightning protection study for a 123 kV substation have been selected in order to underline the versatility and flexibility of the proposed method, capable of modelling not only the grounding system itself, but also the electrical apparatus connected to it.
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**APPENDIX**

The derivation in this Appendix is based on [18] and [24]. According to the fundamental analysis [24], the z-component of the electric field vector of the line source with arbitrary current distribution illustrated in Fig. 6 is given by:

\[ E_z = \frac{1}{j \omega \varepsilon_0} \int_{z_1}^{z_2} \left( \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial z^2} - \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial g}{\partial r} \right) (z') \, dz' \tag{A1} \]

with

\[ g = \exp(-1r), \quad r = \sqrt{\rho^2 + (z-z')^2} \]

Noting that

\[ \frac{\partial g}{\partial z} = \frac{\partial g}{\partial z'}, \quad \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial z^2} = \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial z'^2} \quad \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial z^2} = \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial z'^2} \tag{A2} \]

and integrating the first term in (A1) by parts twice and substituting (A2) in (A1) we have:

\[ E_z = -\frac{1}{j \omega \varepsilon_0} \int_{z_1}^{z_2} \left[ g (z') \frac{\partial g}{\partial z'} + \frac{\partial g}{\partial z'} \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial z'^2} \right] (z') \, dz' + \int_{z_1}^{z_2} \frac{1}{j \omega \varepsilon_0} \left[ \frac{d^2 g}{dz'^2} (z') - \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial g}{\partial z'} \right] \, dz' \tag{A3} \]
If the current between \( z' = z_1 \) and \( z' = z_2 \) is of form

\[
I_k(z) = A \cosh \Gamma z + B \sinh \Gamma z,
\]  

(A4)

the bracketed expression in the integrand of (A3) vanishes. Hence:

\[
E_z = -\frac{I'(z_1) e^{-\Gamma R_1} - I'(z_2) e^{-\Gamma R_2}}{4 \pi i \omega R_1} + \frac{l(z_2) }{R_2} \frac{\partial e^{-\Gamma R_2}}{\partial z} - \frac{l(z_2) }{R_2} \frac{\partial e^{-\Gamma R_2}}{\partial z} \]

where \( I'(z_1) \) and \( I'(z_2) \) denote the derivatives of the current at the end points. The constants \( A \) and \( B \) can be eliminated to express the current distribution in terms of the endpoint currents \( I(z_1) \) and \( I(z_2) \) as follows:

\[
l(z) = \frac{1}{\sinh \Gamma d_k} [I(z_1) \sinh \Gamma (z_2 - z) + I(z_2) \sinh \Gamma (z - z_1)]
\]  

(A6)

From (A6):

\[
I'(z_1) = \frac{\Gamma}{\sinh \Gamma d_k} [I(z_2) - I(z_1) \cosh \Gamma d_k]
\]  

(A7)

\[
I'(z_2) = \frac{\Gamma}{\sinh \Gamma d_k} [I(z_2) \cosh \Gamma d_k - I(z_1)]
\]  

(A8)

Equations (A5) to (A8) yield the \( z \)-component of the electric field in (18). This expression excludes the field contributions from the point charges at the endpoints of the line segments, since these charges disappear when two segments are connected. Such charges are also neglected in case of a segment with no connected end point. It is assumed that the longitudinal current at the open endpoint is zero. Since the point charges there are equal to \(-I/\omega \), they are also zero. It should be noted that this assumption only applies on the longitudinal current at the segment's open endpoint and not on the radial or leakage current.

The same procedure can be repeated for the \( \rho \)-component of the electric field. This will yield:

\[
E_\rho = -\frac{\eta}{4 \pi \rho} \left[ I'(z_2) \cos \theta_2 - I'(z_1) \right] e^{-\Gamma R_1}
\]

\[
-\left[ I'(z_1) \cos \theta_1 - I'(z_2) \right] e^{-\Gamma R_2}
\]  

(A9)

The \( \rho \)-component of the electric field in (18) follows from (A9) and (A6) to (A8).
DISCUSSION

Abdul M. Mousa (B.C. Hydro, Vancouver, Canada). I wish to congratulate Dr. Menter and Dr. Grev for an interesting paper. My comments pertain to soil ionization, a factor which is significant in case of concentrated electrodes, especially where soil resistivity is high. In this connection, it should be noted that Oettle’s work [13] has been superseded by Mousa’s recent paper [25]. The main findings as they pertain to this paper are as follows:

1. The mechanism of breakdown of the soil indicates that no direct correlation exists between the ionization gradient \( E_{\text{ir}} \) and the resistivity \( \rho \) (or the conductivity) of the soil. That fact is proven by the scatter in the relation between \( E_{\text{ir}} \) and \( \rho \) observed by Oettle [26]. Please see Fig. 14.

![Fig. 14. Relation between the ionization gradient and resistivity of the soil according to Oettle.](image)

2. \( E_{\text{ir}} \) is mainly governed by the water content of the soil.
3. Due to inhomogeneity of the soil, \( E_{\text{ir}} \) varies from point to point along the electrode. The effective value of \( E_{\text{ir}} \) is not the average of the subject values, but is rather equal to the minimum value encountered along the electrode.
4. For practical applications, the value of the ionization gradient should be taken equal to 300 kV/m. Based on the above, equations (14) and (16) should be replaced by:
   \[
   E_{\text{ir}} = 300 \text{ kV/m} \quad \ldots(14.1)
   \]
   \[
   E_{\text{ir}} = (\rho/600\pi) (\partial i/\partial z) \quad \ldots(16.1)
   \]
   where \((\partial i/\partial z)\) is in kA/m, and \(\rho\) is in \(\Omega\)m.
5. With typical water content, the value of the relative permittivity of the soil should be around 10 or even higher. The values shown in Figs. 7 and 8 are reasonable. On the other hand the value 1 used in part B of Section V is not realistic.
6. It should be noted that soil ionization was not present in the examples given in Figs. 7 and 9, because the amplitudes of the currents were too small. In the case of Fig. 7 in which a 6 m long rod is located in a soil having \( p = 40 \Omega\)m, the minimum current needed to initiate ionization would be as follows:
   a) About 1.4 KA if eqn. (14.1) is used.
   b) About 2.5 KA if eqn. (14) is used.

The actual current, on the other hand, was only about 30 A.
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F.P. DAWALIBI, Safe Engineering Services & technologies ltd., Montreal, Quebec, Canada, H3M 1G4. The authors should be commended for an excellent paper illustrating the use of transmission line theory and its integration with the EMTP transient program. There is an urgent need for technical contributions in the area of transient performance of grounding systems in order to help refine the various analytical methods in use and determine the domain of their validity by comparing their computation results.

One major simplification of this transmission line approach is the neglect of the inductive, capacitive and perhaps the conductive coupling between the conductor segments of the ground network. According to the authors, this neglect does not lead to significant errors. This conclusion may not be valid at all frequencies and for all ground grid configurations. Indeed our own investigations [1,2] have revealed that coupling from aboveground conductors and loops may affect results even at low frequencies. Is the authors’ conclusion based on extensive simulations or simply the result of a limited number of tests on simple ground configurations?
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Regarding the questions raised by Mr. Farid F. Dawalibi, it should be noted that the aim of this paper was to demonstrate that the transmission line approach for grounding system analysis integrated within the EMTP could lead to practically useful results. The authors' conclusion for the accuracy of the results is based on comparisons with field measurements performed by the EDF, Paris, France. An extensive set of experiments had been performed in Les Renardières in 1976-78 and in St-Brieuc in 1985. All experiments had been repeated to cover any seasonal and weather effects. Among the grounding arrangements under study were vertical ground rods, horizontal earth electrodes, hemispheres, grids, star- and serpentine-shaped electrodes and tower footings. Further reference on the measurements can be found in [20]. The comparison has been performed in Paris in 1992/93 and has been documented in [15]. However, it is true that the investigated earthing structures do not include larger grids; the validation for such structures has been achieved by comparison with a separate program developed by the second author, implementing a rigorous electrodynamic approach. Additional checks and analyses of large structures with conductors above ground may be subject of a future paper.
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