

## About this Article

This material was included with the downloadable supplemental content accompanying the *ARRL Antenna Book*.

You may print a copy of this material for personal use. Any other use of the information requires permission from the ARRL.

## Copyright/Reprint Notice

In general, all ARRL content is copyrighted. ARRL articles, pages, or documents – printed and online – are not in the public domain. Therefore, they may not be freely distributed or copied. Additionally, no part of this document may be copied, sold to third parties, or otherwise commercially exploited without the explicit prior written consent of the ARRL. You cannot post this document to a website or otherwise distribute it to other through any electronic medium.

For permission to quote or reprint material from ARRL, send a request including the issue date, a description of the material requested, and a description of where you intend to use the reprinted material to the ARRL Editorial and Production staff at: **[permission@arrl.org](mailto:permission@arrl.org)**.


# Radiation and Ground Loss Resistances In LF, MF and HF Verticals; Part 2

*With the impending FCC announcement about the release of a new LF and a new MF band, hams will be interested in practical antennas and learning how to calculate EIRP to legally operate on those bands.*

## Soil-Antenna Interaction

As illustrated in Figure 11, one way to analyze a vertical antenna over ground is to use a hypothetical image. If the ground is perfect then the image antenna will be a duplicate of the actual antenna with the same current amplitude and phase. For a dipole a short distance above ground, the image is another dipole the same distance below ground. We now have a system of two coupled dipoles and it's no surprise that  $R_i$  of the upper dipole is no longer  $\approx 72 \Omega$ , but in these examples  $R_i \approx 94 - 100 \Omega$ . What's happening is that the upper vertical (the real one) has a self resistance of  $\approx 72 \Omega$ , but added to that is a mutual resistance ( $R_m$ ) coupled from the image antenna.


If the ground is not perfect, however,



QX1509-Severns11

**Figure 11 — This is an example of an antenna and its image.**

**Figure 12 — Here is a  $\frac{1}{4} \lambda$  vertical antenna with a buried radial screen.**



QX1509-Severns12

then the image antenna will not be an exact replica of the real antenna. The current amplitude and phase on the image will be different, so we should not be surprised if  $R_i$  does not have the same value as either the free space or perfect ground cases. Viewing  $R_i$  as a combination of the free space value and some mutual  $\pm R_m$  because of the soil is perfectly valid, and this was Wait's approach in *Antenna Theory*.<sup>8</sup> He calculated the  $\pm \Delta R_i$

<sup>8</sup>Notes appear on page 28

as the soil and/or radial fan is changed. This  $\pm \Delta R_i$  was a combination of changes in  $R_r$  and  $R_g$ , however, and not  $R_g$  alone.

## **$R_r$ and $R_g$ for a $\frac{1}{4} \lambda$ Vertical Antenna at 7.2 MHz**

The  $\frac{1}{4} \lambda$  vertical antenna with a buried radial screen shown in Figure 12 is more representative of typical amateur antennas for 40 m than a full-height  $\frac{1}{2} \lambda$  vertical dipole. Amateurs are not likely to use a full

$\frac{1}{4} \lambda$  vertical antenna on 630 m, however. Such an antenna would be  $\approx 500$  feet high! We'll look at a more typical 630 m antenna in a later section.

I calculated data points for 16, 32, and 64 radials, with lengths of 2, 5, 10, and 16 m over poor (0.001/5), average (0.005/13) and very good (0.03/20) soils. Figure 13 is a graph showing the behavior of  $R_i$ ,  $R_r$ , and  $R_g$  as a function of radial length when 64 radials are employed over average ground at 7.2 MHz.


On the graph there is a dashed line labeled "36  $\Omega$ " corresponding to the value of  $R_i$  for a resonant  $\frac{1}{4} \lambda$  vertical antenna over infinite perfect ground.

The fact that  $R_i$  does not decrease or even flatten out for radial lengths  $> \frac{1}{4} \lambda$  but instead starts to increase has been predicted analytically (for example in Wait — see note 8), my earlier NEC modeling (see Appendix D) and as seen in practice. (Note: Appendices A, B, C, and D are available for download from the ARRL QEX files website.) What's

interesting is that  $R_r \neq 36 \Omega$ !  $R_r$  starts out well below the value for an infinite perfect ground plane, but as the radial length is extended it approaches 36  $\Omega$ . Increasing the radial number and/or extending radial


length also moves  $R_r$  closer to 36  $\Omega$ . Figure 13 represents only one case: 64 radials over average ground.

Figure 14 gives a broader view of the behavior of  $R_r$  for different soils and radial



**Figure 13 — This graph shows  $R_i$ ,  $R_r$ , and  $R_g$  as a function of radial length for a 40 m  $\frac{1}{4} \lambda$  vertical antenna.**

QX1507-Severns13



QX1507-Severns14

**Figure 14 — Here is a graph that plots  $R_i$  as a function of soil, radial number, and radial length.**

numbers as radial length is varied.

It's abundantly clear that  $R_r \neq 36 \Omega$  but as we improve the soil conductivity and/or increase the number and/or length of the radials  $R_r$  converges on  $36 \Omega$ . We can also graph the values for  $R_g$  as shown in Figure 15, which nicely illustrates how more numerous and longer radials reduce ground losses.

For a given model, NEC will give us  $R_r$ ,  $G_a$ , and the field data from which we can determine  $R_r$  using the Poynting vector and a spreadsheet. With this information we can have some fun!  $R_r / R_i$  is the radiation efficiency, including only the ground losses within the radius of integration, which in this case is  $\approx \frac{1}{2} \lambda$ .  $G_a$  is the radiation efficiency including all the losses, near and far field. The ratio  $G_a / (R_r / R_i)$  gives us the loss in the far field, separate from the near field losses. Figure 16 graphs all three,  $G_a$ ,  $R_r / R_i$ , and  $G_a / (R_r / R_i)$  with various numbers of radials over average ground. Note that the far field loss is almost independent of the radial




Figure 15 — This graph plots  $R_g$  as a function of radial length and number.




Figure 16 — Here is a graph of antenna efficiency as a function of radial length and number.

number or radial lengths, which is what you would expect because we haven't changed anything in the far field as we modified the radials. In fact any bumps or anomalies in that graph would indicate a screw-up in the calculations! It serves as a much needed cross check on the calculations.

After seeing Figure 16, Steve Stearns, K6OIK, suggested adding a graph of  $(R_i / R_g) - G_a$ , which is the ground wave radiation efficiency. This is shown in Figure 17.

By repeating the calculations for a  $\frac{1}{4} \lambda$

vertical at 1.8 MHz, we can compare the results to expose the effect of frequency on  $R_i$ ,  $R_r$ , and  $R_g$  for the same type of antenna. An example is given in Figure 18. The solid lines are for 1.8 MHz and the dashed lines 7.2 MHz.

What we see is that even though both antennas are  $\frac{1}{4} \lambda$ , with the same length radials (in  $\lambda$ ) and the same soil characteristic, the values for  $R_i$ ,  $R_r$ , and  $R_g$  are substantially different. At 1.8 MHz,  $R_i$  is much closer to 36  $\Omega$ . Using  $\frac{1}{4} \lambda$  radials at 7.2 MHz and

integrating the radiated power,  $R_g \approx 8 \Omega$ . If you subtracted the  $R_i$  value given by NEC from 36  $\Omega$ , however, you would think  $R_g$  was essentially zero! At 1.8 MHz,  $R_g = 36 - R_i \approx 2 \Omega$ , which seems reasonable. The power integration for the 1.8 MHz vertical gives  $R_g \approx 6 \Omega$ , however, which means the efficiency is lower than we thought. As the soil conductivity ( $\sigma$ ) increases, the values for  $R_i$  move closer to 36  $\Omega$ . If we lower the frequency to the lower AM broadcast band (say 600 kHz) using a  $\frac{1}{4} \lambda$  vertical with 120  $0.4 \lambda$  radials,  $R_i$  will be very close to 36  $\Omega$ . This is a frequency range where a great deal of profession work has been done, which might explain why the discrepancy between estimated and actual  $R_g$  and  $R_r$  went unnoticed. The difference would be very small, easily within the range of experimental error!

### A Small 630 Meter Vertical Antenna

On 630 m (472 to 479 kHz), where  $1 \lambda \approx 2000$  feet, any practical antenna is very likely to be small in terms of wavelength. Figure 19 shows an example of a short top-loaded vertical for 630 m. The vertical is 15.24 m high (50 feet,  $0.024 \lambda$ ) with 7.62 m (25 feet,  $0.012 \lambda$ ) radial arms in the hat. The usual practice for very short verticals is to have a dense ground system that extends some distance beyond the edge of the top-hat and/or a bit longer than the height of the vertical. Two cases were modeled: 64 and 128 radials, all 18 m long.

The results calculated from the NEC field data are given in Table 1. Over perfect ground  $R_r = 0.7 \Omega$

For this antenna with real soils,  $R_r$  is somewhat higher than the perfect ground case and converges on the perfect ground case as the soil conductivity improves. In this example using the perfect ground value for  $R_r$  yields an efficiency somewhat lower than real soil, as shown in the  $0.7 / R_i$  column, but the difference is not very large. We should also keep in mind, as shown in Appendix C, that the computed values for  $R_r$  depend on the integration radius, which is somewhat arbitrary. If I had used a slightly larger radius, the  $R_r$  values would have been a bit lower, or closer to the ideal ground value.

### Summary

For a lossless antenna in a lossless environment, the calculation of radiation resistance is very straight forward: integrate the power density over a hypothetical surface enclosing the antenna. The net power outflow divided by the square of the rms current at the feed point gives  $R_r$ . We can extend this technique to antennas in a lossy environment by using the field values obtained from NEC modeling and a spreadsheet.

At HF, values for  $R_r$  over real soils appear




Figure 17 — This graph plots ground wave radiation efficiency;  $(R_i / R_g) - G_a$ .




Figure 18 — Here is a graph showing  $R_i$ ,  $R_r$ , and  $R_g$  for a  $\frac{1}{4} \lambda$  vertical antenna with 64 radials at 1.8 and 7.2 MHz.

to be significantly lower than the values for the same antennas over perfect ground, at least in the case of  $\frac{1}{4}\lambda$  and  $\frac{1}{2}\lambda$  vertical antennas! For short verticals at LF and MF, however, the real-ground  $R_r$  appears to be close to the ideal-ground value depending on the details of the soil and the ground system. It is my opinion that calculating  $P_r$  and efficiency using the perfect ground value for  $R_r$  is a reasonable approximation for the vertical antennas likely to be used by Amateur Radio operators at 630 m and 2200 m.

Measuring E-field intensities accurately many km from the antenna at low power levels and also figuring out the ground wave attenuation factors from soil measurements isn't practical for most hams. At LF and MF, forget the E-field measurements; just do some simple modeling to determine  $R_r$  over perfect ground and measure your base current:  $P_r = I_o^2 R_r$ !

## Acknowledgements

I want to express my appreciation to Steve Stearns, K6OIK, for his very helpful review of this article. He put in a lot of effort and I've incorporated many of his suggestions in the main article and in the Appendices. I also appreciate the comments from Dean Straw, N6BV, and Al Christman, K3LC. All of the modeling employed a prototype version of Roy Lewallen's *EZNEC Pro/4* that implements *NEC 4.2* and Dan McGuire's (AC6LA) *AutoEZ* which is an *EXCEL* spreadsheet that interacts with *EZNEC* to greatly expand the modeling options.<sup>10, 11</sup> Without these wonderful tools this study would not have been practical and I strongly recommend both programs.\

*Rudy Severns, N6LF, was first licensed as WN7WAG in 1954 and has held an Amateur Extra class license since 1959. He is a consultant in the design of power electronics, magnetic components and power conversion equipment. Rudy holds a BSE degree from the University of California at Los Angeles. He is the author of three books, more than 90 technical papers and a past editor of QEX. Rudy is an ARRL Life Member and an IEEE Life Fellow.\*

## Notes

<sup>8</sup>J. Wait, R. Collin and F. Zucker, *Antenna Theory*, Chap 23, Inter-University Electronics Series (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969), Vol 7, pp 414 – 424.

<sup>9</sup>The Appendices and other files associated with this article are available for downloading from the ARRL QEX files web page. Go to [www.arrl.org/qexfiles](http://www.arrl.org/qexfiles) and look for the file **7x15\_Severns.zip**.

<sup>10</sup>Roy Lewallen, W7EL, *EZNEC pro/4*, [www.eznec.com](http://www.eznec.com).

<sup>11</sup>Dan McGuire, AC6LA, *AutoEZ*, [www.ac6la.com/autoez.html](http://www.ac6la.com/autoez.html).

**Table 1A**


**630 m Vertical 64 Radials, Integration Radius = 100 m.**

Soil	$R_i$ [ $\Omega$ ]	$R_r$ [ $\Omega$ ]	$R_g$ [ $\Omega$ ]	$R_r / R_i$	$0.7 / R_i$	$G_a$
0.001/5	5.50	1.01	4.49	0.18	0.13	0.060
0.005/13	2.01	0.844	1.17	0.42	0.34	0.232
0.03/20	1.09	0.76	0.32	0.70	0.63	0.533
Perfect	0.69	0.69	0	1.00	1.00	1

**Table 1B**

**630 m Vertical 128 Radials, Integration Radius = 100 m.**

Soil	$R_i$ [W]	$R_r$ [W]	$R_g$ [W]	$R_r / R_i$	$0.7 / R_i$	$G_a$
0.001/5	4.90	1.009	3.895	0.21	0.14	0.067
0.005/13	1.883	0.843	1.04	0.45	0.37	0.247
0.03/20	1.033	0.78	0.253	0.76	0.67	0.561
Perfect	0.69	0.69	0	1.00	1.00	1.00



QX1509-Severns19

**Figure 19 — This model shows a 630 m antenna example.**

There was an error in the way Equation SB2 was printed in Part 1 of this article. That equation, in the **EIRP and Radiated Power,  $P_r$ , From Verticals** sidebar on page 29 of the July/August 2015 issue of *QEX*, was printed without the subscripts, superscripts and equals sign. There was also an error in the denominator of the equation. The correct equation is reproduced here. We apologize for this error, and offer our thanks to Andy Talbot, G4JNT, for being the first to point out the problem with this equation. — Ed.

$$EIRP = \frac{r^2 |E_z|^2}{30} [W]$$

[Eq SB2]