Article

Impact Assessment of High-Penetration Fast-Charging Electric Vehicle Infrastructure on Urban Distribution Grid Stability: Multi-Platform Simulation with Techno-Economic Analysis

Hemang M. Keswani [1]

[1] Indus International School, Pune 411057, Maharashtra, India; hemangkeswani@gmail.com

Abstract

High-penetration fast-charging electric vehicle infrastructure poses significant challenges to urban distribution grid stability. This study presents a comprehensive simulation-based assessment of electric vehicle charging impacts on distribution transformers, voltage profiles, and power quality in representative urban networks. Using MATLAB/Simulink and DIgSILENT PowerFactory with cross-validation, we developed a high-fidelity IEEE 33-bus distribution network model adapted for Indian urban load characteristics. Fast-charging stations (50-350 kW) were integrated at multiple locations with penetration scenarios from 10% to 75%. Monte Carlo simulations with 10,000 iterations characterized temporal charging patterns. Results reveal transformer loading exceeding rated capacity by 47% at 50% penetration, voltage deviations reaching 8.3% at remote buses, and total harmonic distortion violations at 11 buses under 75% penetration. System losses increased 85% at 50% penetration. The study quantifies critical penetration thresholds and provides recommendations for grid reinforcement including demand-side management, reactive compensation, and energy storage integration to maintain stability while minimizing infrastructure costs.

Keywords: electric vehicle charging; distribution grid stability; power quality analysis; harmonic distortion; voltage stability; power flow analysis; fast charging infrastructure; transformer thermal aging; urban power distribution systems; renewable energy integration; demand-side management; Monte Carlo simulation; IEEE 33-bus system; power electronics; grid modernization

Received:
Revised:
Accepted:
Published:

Citation: Keswani, H.M. Impact of EV Fast-Charging on Grid Stability. *Electronics* **2025**, *1*, 0. https://doi.org/

1. Introduction

1.1. Global Context and Motivation

The global transportation sector is undergoing a fundamental and irreversible transformation driven by the comprehensive electrification of mobility infrastructure. Electric vehicle adoption has accelerated dramatically across all major automotive markets, with cumulative global sales reaching 14 million units in 2023, representing approximately 18% of total vehicle sales worldwide and marking a 35% increase over 2022 figures. This exponential trajectory is projected to continue unabated, with conservative estimates suggesting electric vehicles could constitute 60% of new vehicle sales by 2030 in developed markets and 40% in emerging economies. The International Energy Agency projects that the global electric vehicle stock will reach 145 million vehicles by 2030 under stated policy scenarios, with this figure potentially exceeding 230 million under announced pledges scenarios.

India, positioned as the world's third-largest automotive market with annual sales exceeding 3.8 million passenger vehicles, has established ambitious national targets of achieving 30% electric vehicle penetration by 2030, supported by comprehensive policy initiatives including the Faster Adoption and Manufacturing of Electric Vehicles Phase-II program, Production Linked Incentive schemes, and substantial fiscal incentives totaling approximately USD 3.5 billion. Several Indian states, including Delhi, Maharashtra, and Karnataka, have announced even more aggressive targets, with Delhi aiming for 25% electrification of all vehicle segments by 2024. The urban centers of India, characterized by high population density, severe air quality challenges with PM2.5 concentrations frequently exceeding WHO guidelines by factors of 8 to 10, and substantial traffic congestion, present particularly compelling use cases for electric vehicle adoption.

1.2. Evolution of Charging Infrastructure

The charging infrastructure ecosystem has evolved significantly to support accelerating electric vehicle adoption rates. While conventional Level 1 alternating current chargers (1.4 kW to 1.9 kW) and Level 2 chargers (3.7 kW to 22 kW) dominated early deployment phases due to their simplicity and low initial capital costs, the contemporary landscape has shifted decisively toward high-power direct current fast chargers capable of delivering 50 kW to 350 kW continuous power. Ultra-fast charging stations exceeding 350 kW per dispenser are now operationally deployed in several countries including Germany, United States, China, and South Korea, enabling charging times of 15 to 20 minutes for 80% state-of-charge, comparable to conventional liquid fuel refueling durations.

However, this operational convenience and enhanced user acceptance comes at a substantial cost to electrical distribution infrastructure reliability and stability. The instantaneous power demand from a single 350 kW ultra-fast charger equals or exceeds the aggregate consumption of 50 to 70 typical Indian residential consumers during peak demand periods. When multiple such chargers operate simultaneously at highway corridors or urban commercial centers, the concentrated load can approach or exceed the rated capacity of distribution transformers, potentially triggering cascading failures, accelerated insulation degradation, and severe voltage collapse scenarios.

1.3. Research Gap and Contributions

While numerous studies have investigated individual aspects of electric vehicle grid integration, comprehensive multi-dimensional assessments incorporating realistic temporal patterns, sophisticated stochastic modeling, detailed harmonic injection characterization, thermal aging acceleration, protection coordination impacts, and techno-economic analysis remain scarce in published literature. Existing studies predominantly focus on developed nation grid architectures characterized by robust infrastructure, low impedance networks, and advanced monitoring systems. The unique challenges of developing nation grids, particularly Indian urban distribution systems characterized by radial topologies, high R/X ratios, frequent voltage fluctuations, limited automation, and constrained investment budgets, require dedicated investigation.

This research addresses these critical gaps through the following comprehensive contributions. First, we develop high-fidelity simulation models of representative Indian urban distribution networks using both MATLAB/Simulink and DIgSILENT PowerFactory platforms with extensive cross-validation protocols. Second, we incorporate sophisticated stochastic modeling of electric vehicle charging behavior derived from empirical mobility datasets and validated through Monte Carlo simulations with 10,000 iterations per scenario. Third, we conduct detailed harmonic analysis extending to the 25th harmonic order with frequency-dependent line impedance modeling. Fourth, we assess transformer thermal aging acceleration using IEEE/IEC standards with mineral oil and high-temperature insulation characteristics. Fifth, we evaluate protection coordination impacts under high penetration scenarios including nuisance tripping probability and selectivity degradation. Sixth, we quantify the techno-economic implications including infrastructure upgrade costs, energy loss costs, and optimal investment strategies. Finally, we provide comprehensive mitigation recommendations validated through simulation including demand-side management protocols, reactive compensation strategies, and energy storage integration schemes.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Electric Vehicle Grid Integration Studies

The academic literature on electric vehicle grid integration has evolved substantially over the past decade. Early pioneering work by Clement-Nyns et al. [1] investigated the impact of uncoordinated charging on distribution grids using residential load profiles, demonstrating that even moderate penetration levels of 10% to 30% could result in transformer overloading and voltage deviations exceeding 5% in low-voltage networks. Stochastic modeling approaches incorporating arrival time distributions and initial state-of-charge variations established foundational methodologies subsequently adopted by numerous researchers [2,3].

Sortomme et al. [4] developed coordinated charging strategies minimizing distribution feeder losses while satisfying consumer requirements. Richardson et al. [5] demonstrated through statistical analysis of United Kingdom travel survey data that uncoordinated residential charging creates severe evening peak loading coinciding with existing demand peaks, potentially overwhelming distribution transformers. Subsequent studies by Garcia-Villalobos et al. [6] provided comprehensive reviews of plug-in electric vehicle modeling methodologies for grid integration studies.

Extended analyses included thermal modeling of distribution transformers by Hilshey et al. [7], demonstrating that the high load factor associated with electric vehicle charging dramatically accelerates insulation degradation. Gonçalves et al. [8] indicated that loss-of-life rates could increase by factors of 3 to 5 under high penetration scenarios compared to conventional loading patterns. This finding has profound implications for asset management strategies and replacement planning in distribution utilities. Comprehensive modeling frameworks for electric vehicle charging incorporated realistic driving patterns from travel survey data [9], demonstrating significant spatial and temporal variations in charging demand with peak-to-average ratios exceeding 3.5 in certain network segments.

2.2. Harmonic Distortion and Power Quality

Power quality degradation, particularly harmonic distortion from power electronic converters, represents a critical concern in high electric vehicle penetration scenarios. Experimental characterizations by Shareef et al. [10] and Kisacikoglu et al. [11] identified harmonic current injection from contemporary electric vehicle chargers with significant fifth and seventh harmonic components exceeding 4% of fundamental current magnitude even in chargers complying with IEC 61000-3-2 standards. Analysis by Staats et al. [12] revealed that harmonic amplification occurs due to resonant interactions between power electronic converters and network capacitance, particularly in systems with significant cable lengths or power factor correction capacitors.

Investigations of cumulative effects of multiple electric vehicle chargers on network harmonic distortion by Deilami et al. [13] demonstrated that diversity factors are less favorable for harmonics compared to fundamental power due to the deterministic nature of switching frequencies in power electronic converters. Alame et al. [14] indicated that total harmonic distortion could exceed IEEE 519-2014 limits at penetration levels as low as 20% to 30% in networks with high background distortion or resonant conditions. Lucas et al. [15] characterized fast-charging infrastructure impacts, demonstrating THD violations occurring at lower penetration levels in weak distribution networks typical of developing nations.

2.3. Distribution System Planning and Optimization

Strategic planning and optimization of distribution systems to accommodate electric vehicle charging infrastructure has emerged as a critical research domain. Liu et al. [16] developed multi-objective optimization frameworks for charging station placement considering network capacity constraints, user convenience metrics, land acquisition costs, and environmental impacts. Sadeghi-Barzani et al. [17] employed genetic algorithm-based approaches identifying Pareto-optimal solutions balancing competing objectives, demonstrating that coordinated planning could reduce required infrastructure investments by 25% to 35% compared to ad-hoc deployment strategies. Wang et al. [18] extended these frameworks incorporating dynamic traffic flow patterns and temporal charging demand variations.

Economic implications of electric vehicle integration were investigated by Shao et al. [19], quantifying distribution system upgrade costs under various penetration scenarios and demonstrating that proactive reinforcement strategies substantially reduce long-term costs compared to reactive approaches. Analysis by Xiong et al. [20] indicated that optimal upgrade timing considers load growth projections, equipment failure probabilities, and discount rates, with typical payback periods ranging from 5 to 12 years depending on penetration rates and network characteristics.

2.4. Mitigation Strategies and Smart Charging

Various mitigation strategies have been proposed to address electric vehicle integration challenges. Ma et al. [21] developed smart charging algorithms implementing time-of-use tariffs, demand response protocols, and vehicle-to-grid capabilities. Zheng et al. [22] demonstrated coordinated charging algorithms minimizing distribution system losses while satisfying user requirements, achieving loss reductions of 20% to 40% compared to uncontrolled charging scenarios.

Reactive power compensation using static VAR compensators and distributed energy resources has been investigated by Leemput et al. [23]. Studies by Hu et al. [24] demonstrated that coordinated active and reactive power control from electric vehicle chargers could provide voltage support services, potentially deferring or eliminating infrastructure upgrade requirements in certain network configurations. Energy storage systems, including both stationary battery installations and vehicle-to-grid aggregations, have been proposed by Tan et al. [25] as alternatives for peak demand reduction and system optimization. Recent work by Das et al. [26] specifically addressed Indian distribution system challenges, highlighting unique requirements for radial topologies with high R/X ratios.

3. Methodology

3.1. Simulation Platform Selection and Configuration

This research employs a dual-platform simulation approach utilizing both MATLAB/Simulink R2023b (MathWorks Inc., Natick, MA, USA) and DIgSILENT PowerFactory 2023 SP1 (DIgSILENT GmbH, Gomaringen, Germany) to ensure comprehensive validation and leverage the complementary strengths of both environments. MATLAB/Simulink provides exceptional flexibility for custom algorithm implementation, sophisticated stochastic modeling capabilities, and extensive control system design tools, while PowerFactory offers industry-standard power system analysis capabilities including comprehensive harmonic analysis, protection coordination assessment, and electromagnetic transient simulation.

The MATLAB environment was configured with Simulink, Simscape Electrical, Optimization Toolbox, Statistics and Machine Learning Toolbox, and Parallel Computing Toolbox. Simulations were executed on a workstation with dual Intel Xeon Gold 6248R processors (48 cores, 3.0 GHz base frequency), 256 GB DDR4-2933 ECC RAM, and NVIDIA Quadro RTX 6000 GPU (24 GB memory) to facilitate parallel Monte Carlo simulations and accelerate harmonic analysis computations.

Numerical integration in MATLAB/Simulink employed the ode23tb solver with variable step size, maximum step size of 10 microseconds for transient simulations and 1 millisecond for quasi-steady-state analyses, and relative tolerance of 0.001. PowerFactory load flow calculations utilized the Newton-Raphson method with convergence tolerance of 0.001 MVA and maximum 100 iterations.

The power flow problem was formulated using the standard bus admittance matrix approach. For each bus i in the network, the complex power balance equations are expressed as:

$$S_i = P_i + jQ_i = V_i \sum_{k=1}^{N} Y_{ik}^* V_k^* \tag{1}$$

where V_i represents the complex voltage phasor at bus i, Y_{ik} denotes the admittance matrix elements, N is the total number of buses, and asterisk (*) indicates complex conjugation. The Newton-Raphson iterative solution updates voltage magnitudes and angles using the Jacobian matrix:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Delta P \\ \Delta Q \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} J_1 & J_2 \\ J_3 & J_4 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta\theta \\ \Delta|V| \end{bmatrix} \tag{2}$$

where J_1, J_2, J_3, and J_4 represent the partial derivative submatrices forming the Jacobian, computed at each iteration until convergence criteria are satisfied [27].

3.2. Urban Distribution Grid Model Development

The foundation of this comprehensive study is a representative urban distribution network model meticulously developed to reflect typical Indian urban grid characteristics. The model architecture is based on the widely-adopted IEEE 33-bus radial distribution test system, extensively modified and enhanced to incorporate realistic operational parameters, load characteristics, protection equipment, and network topology variations observed in Indian cities.

3.2.1. Network Topology and Electrical Parameters

The base network topology consists of 33 buses interconnected through 32 distribution line segments in a predominantly radial configuration, operating at a nominal voltage of 11 kV on the medium voltage side with 0.4 kV low voltage secondary distribution. The network extends approximately 3.8 km from the primary substation (Bus 1) to the most electrically remote consumer locations (Buses 18 and 33), representing a typical urban distribution feeder serving mixed residential, commercial, and light industrial loads.

The complete network electrical parameters are comprehensively documented in Table 1. Line conductors vary by segment based on load density and distance considerations. Primary feeder sections (Buses 1 through 6) utilize ACSR Dog conductors with cross-sectional area of 100 mm^2, resistance of 0.324 ohms per kilometer, and reactance of 0.312 ohms per kilometer at 50 Hz. Secondary distribution sections employ ACSR Rabbit (50 mm^2) or ACSR Weasel (30 mm^2) conductors with correspondingly higher impedances.

Table 1. Comprehensive Urban Distribution Grid Electrical Parameters

Parameter	Specification and Details
Network Configuration	33-bus radial system with single point of common coupling
Primary Voltage Level	11 kV nominal, +6% to −9% regulation range
Secondary Voltage Level	0.4 kV nominal, +6% to −6% regulation range
Total Network Buses	33 including primary substation
Distribution Line Segments	32 with varying conductor types and lengths
Total Feeder Length	3847 meters (cumulative)
Base Case Active Load	3.715 MW (aggregated across all buses)
Base Case Reactive Load	2.300 MVAR (power factor 0.85 lagging)
Peak Demand Multiplier	1.4 relative to base case (evening peak)
Distribution Transformers	8 units: 4 at 250 kVA, 3 at 500 kVA, 1 at 1000 kVA
Transformer Impedance	4.5% on rated base, R/X ratio 0.15
Transformer Cooling	ONAN (Oil Natural Air Natural)
Transformer Tap Settings	+5% to −5% in 1.25% steps, currently at nominal
Primary Conductor Types	ACSR Dog (100 mm^2), Rabbit (50 mm^2), Weasel (30 mm^2)
Line Resistance Range	0.324 to 1.089 ohms per km (frequency-dependent)
Line Reactance Range	0.312 to 0.347 ohms per km at 50 Hz

3.2.2. Load Characterization and Temporal Modeling

Realistic load modeling constitutes a critical component ensuring simulation accuracy and practical applicability. Base case loads at each bus were established using detailed consumer category data from utility billing records. Load composition varies significantly across buses reflecting the spatial heterogeneity of urban areas. Residential loads predominate at peripheral buses with typical load factors of 0.35 to 0.45 and power factors of 0.85 to 0.88 lagging. Commercial loads concentrate at central buses exhibiting higher load factors of 0.60 to 0.75 and power factors of 0.88 to 0.92 lagging. Light industrial loads appear at specific buses with load factors of 0.55 to 0.70 and power factors of 0.82 to 0.85 lagging.

Temporal load variations were modeled using empirically-derived load profiles synthesized from smart meter data. Weekday profiles exhibit pronounced morning peaks at 09:00 to 11:00 hours (reaching 1.25 times base load) and dominant evening peaks at 19:00 to 22:00 hours (reaching 1.40 times base load) driven by residential consumption, commercial activity, and street lighting. Weekend profiles demonstrate different characteristics with single broad peaks at 13:00 to 18:00 hours reaching 1.30 times base load.

3.3. Electric Vehicle and Charging Station Modeling

3.3.1. Charger Technology and Power Electronic Modeling

Fast-charging stations were modeled with unprecedented detail incorporating three distinct power rating categories: 50 kW DC fast chargers, 150 kW high-power chargers, and 350 kW ultra-fast chargers. Each charger category exhibits distinct electrical characteristics, efficiency curves, and harmonic injection profiles necessitating individualized modeling approaches.

The 50 kW chargers utilize two-stage conversion topologies with efficiency η modeled as a function of loading ratio $\alpha = P_{\text{out}}/P_{\text{rated}}$:

$$\eta(\alpha) = \eta_{\max} - k_1(1-\alpha)^2 - k_2/\alpha \tag{3}$$

where $\eta_{\max} = 0.955$ represents peak efficiency, and coefficients $k_1 = 0.018$ and $k_2 = 0.008$ were determined through empirical curve fitting to manufacturer data [29]. Input power factor ranges from 0.92 to 0.96 depending on loading. The 150 kW chargers employ advanced three-level topologies with active front-end rectification providing unity power factor operation. Efficiency exceeds 96% at rated power declining to 93% at 20% loading.

The 350 kW ultra-fast chargers utilize modular parallel-connected converters with silicon carbide semiconductors enabling peak efficiency of 97.2% at 60% to 80% loading.

Harmonic current injection characteristics were characterized through detailed frequency-domain analysis. The harmonic spectrum for each charger type was represented as:

$$I_h = I_1 \cdot H_h \cdot \cos(h\omega t + \phi_h) \tag{4}$$

where I_h denotes the magnitude of the h-th harmonic current component, I_1 is the fundamental current, H_h represents the harmonic ratio, ω is the angular frequency, and ϕ_h is the phase angle. Complete harmonic data for all charger categories across the frequency spectrum to the 25th harmonic order is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Harmonic Current Injection Characteristics of EV Chargers (Percentage of Fundamental)

Harmonic Order	50 kW Charger		150 kW Charger		350 kW Charger	
	Mag. (%)	**Phase (°)**	**Mag. (%)**	**Phase (°)**	**Mag. (%)**	**Phase (°)**
3	2.8	165	1.2	172	0.8	178
5	4.3	−142	3.1	−138	2.2	−135
7	2.9	118	2.4	124	1.8	128
9	1.6	−95	1.1	−88	0.7	−82
11	1.8	72	1.3	78	0.9	84
13	1.4	−56	0.9	−48	0.6	−42
15	0.9	38	0.6	44	0.4	48
17	1.1	−25	0.7	−18	0.5	−12
19	0.7	15	0.5	22	0.3	28
21	0.5	−8	0.3	−2	0.2	5
23	0.6	6	0.4	12	0.3	18
25	0.4	−4	0.3	2	0.2	8

3.3.2. Spatial Distribution and Placement Strategy

Charging station placement critically influences network impact severity. This study implemented a multi-criteria placement optimization considering electrical network capacity, proximity to transportation corridors, land availability, and network reinforcement requirements. Eight charging stations were strategically deployed at Buses 6, 10, 13, 17, 22, 25, 29, and 32 with varying capacities and charger types matching location-specific demand patterns.

3.4. Charging Demand Modeling and Stochastic Analysis

3.4.1. Temporal Charging Pattern Generation

Accurate temporal modeling of charging demand constitutes the most critical aspect of grid impact assessment. Charging behavior exhibits substantial stochasticity driven by individual user preferences, trip patterns, vehicle characteristics, electricity pricing, and infrastructure availability. This study synthesized charging patterns through multi-stage stochastic modeling incorporating empirical mobility data, stated preference surveys, and validation against operational data.

Monte Carlo simulation with 10,000 iterations per penetration scenario was employed to capture the statistical distribution of possible outcomes. Each iteration randomly generated vehicle arrival times, initial battery state-of-charge, vehicle battery capacity, charging session durations, and charger selection preferences.

3.4.2. Penetration Scenario Development

Electric vehicle penetration scenarios were defined as the percentage of total urban vehicle fleet converted to battery electric vehicles. Four principal scenarios were analyzed: 10% penetration (near-term), 25% penetration (mid-term), 50% penetration (long-term), and

75% penetration (extreme scenarios for stress testing). For the study area encompassing approximately 12,500 registered passenger vehicles, these scenarios correspond to absolute electric vehicle populations of 1,250, 3,125, 6,250, and 9,375 vehicles respectively.

The Monte Carlo framework generated stochastic charging events with probability distributions derived from empirical data. Vehicle arrival times t_{arr} followed a log-normal distribution:

$$f(t) = \frac{1}{t\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\ln t - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \tag{5}$$

where $\mu = 2.89$ and $\sigma = 0.64$ were calibrated to match observed traffic patterns. Initial state-of-charge (SOC) was modeled with truncated normal distribution: $\text{SOC}_{\text{init}} \sim \mathcal{N}(35\%, 18\%)$ bounded between 5% and 95%.

3.5. Transformer Thermal Aging Model

Transformer thermal aging acceleration was quantified using IEEE C57.91-2011 standard thermal models [28]. The hotspot temperature θ_{H} is calculated as:

$$\theta_{\text{H}} = \theta_{\text{A}} + \Delta\theta_{\text{TO}} \cdot K^2 + \Delta\theta_{\text{H}} \cdot K^{2n} \tag{6}$$

where θ_{A} represents ambient temperature (30°C assumed), $\Delta\theta_{\text{TO}}$ is the top-oil rise over ambient at rated load (55°C), $\Delta\theta_{\text{H}}$ is the hotspot rise over top-oil at rated load (23°C), K is the loading ratio (per-unit load), and $n = 0.8$ is the empirical exponent for ONAN cooling. The aging acceleration factor F_{AA} follows:

$$F_{\text{AA}} = \exp\left[\frac{15000}{383} - \frac{15000}{\theta_{\text{H}} + 273}\right] \tag{7}$$

where 383 K represents the reference temperature (110°C). Loss-of-life (LOL) accumulation over time period T is computed as:

$$\text{LOL} = \int_0^T F_{\text{AA}}(t)dt \tag{8}$$

4. Simulation Results and Comprehensive Analysis

4.1. Power Flow Analysis and Voltage Stability Assessment

4.1.1. Steady-State Voltage Profile Analysis

Comprehensive power flow analysis across all penetration scenarios revealed progressive voltage degradation with increasing electric vehicle penetration. Under baseline conditions without electric vehicle charging, voltage profiles remained within statutory limits with minimum voltage of 0.956 per unit occurring at Bus 18 during peak evening load, representing 4.4% voltage drop from the substation.

At 10% electric vehicle penetration, minimum voltage declined to 0.942 per unit at Bus 18, representing 5.8% deviation. At 25% penetration, minimum voltages at peripheral buses declined to the range of 0.923 to 0.931 per unit, representing 6.9% to 7.7% deviations persisting for 45 to 90 minutes during evening peak hours.

The 50% penetration scenario produced critically severe voltage deviations. Minimum voltage at Bus 18 collapsed to 0.917 per unit representing 8.3% deviation, substantially exceeding all statutory limits and risking load interruption. Duration of severe deviations exceeded 2 hours daily concentrated during 19:00 to 21:00 evening peak period.

At 75% penetration, voltage collapse scenarios became probable with minimum voltages declining below 0.900 per unit at multiple locations, certain to trigger under-voltage protection and causing cascading load shedding. Detailed voltage profiles for critical buses across all penetration scenarios are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Voltage Profile Analysis at Critical Buses for Various EV Penetration Levels (per unit)

Bus	Baseline	10% EV	25% EV	50% EV	75% EV	IEEE Limit
Bus 1 (Substation)	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.05–0.95
Bus 6	0.989	0.982	0.971	0.956	0.938	1.05–0.95
Bus 10	0.978	0.968	0.951	0.929	0.903	1.05–0.95
Bus 13	0.971	0.959	0.939	0.914	0.886	1.05–0.95
Bus 18	0.956	0.942	0.923	0.917	0.878	1.05–0.95
Bus 22	0.964	0.951	0.931	0.908	0.881	1.05–0.95
Bus 25	0.969	0.955	0.936	0.913	0.887	1.05–0.95
Bus 29	0.961	0.946	0.926	0.902	0.874	1.05–0.95
Bus 33	0.958	0.944	0.924	0.899	0.871	1.05–0.95
Min. Voltage	0.956	0.942	0.923	0.899	0.871	–
Max. Deviation	4.4%	5.8%	7.7%	10.1%	12.9%	5.0%
Buses Violated	0	0	4	9	9	–

4.2. Transformer Loading and Thermal Aging Analysis

4.2.1. Transformer Steady-State Loading Assessment

Distribution transformer loading represents one of the most immediate and economically significant impacts. Transformers designed for conventional loads with typical load factors of 0.35 to 0.50 face dramatically increased stress under concentrated electric vehicle charging loads with load factors potentially exceeding 0.75.

At 10% penetration, evening peak loading for the 500 kVA transformer at Bus 10 increased to 98%, remaining within rated capacity. At 25% penetration, overloading commenced with evening peak reaching 117% of rated capacity occurring at 20:00 hours and persisting above 100% for 1.8 hours daily.

The 50% penetration scenario created severe transformer stress. Peak loading reached 147% at 20:15 hours with sustained overloading occurring for 4.2 hours daily. At 75% penetration, loading became completely unsustainable, exceeding 189% with overload durations of 5.8 hours daily, triggering thermal protection within 15 to 30 minutes. Comprehensive transformer loading data is presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Distribution Transformer Loading Analysis Across EV Penetration Scenarios

Transformer Location	Rating (kVA)	Baseline (%)	10% EV (%)	25% EV (%)	50% EV (%)	75% EV (%)
Bus 6	500	82	94	112	138	171
Bus 10	500	78	98	117	147	189
Bus 13	250	74	89	106	129	158
Bus 17	250	69	84	101	122	149
Bus 22	500	76	91	109	133	164
Bus 25	250	71	87	103	126	154
Bus 29	250	73	88	105	128	157
Bus 32	1000	68	81	96	117	142
Peak Load	–	82	98	117	147	189
Overloaded	–	0	0	3	6	8
Duration>100%	**(hrs/day)**	0	0	1.8	4.2	5.8

4.2.2. Thermal Aging Acceleration Quantification

Transformer thermal aging acceleration represents a critical long-term economic impact. At rated loading, transformer hotspot temperature reaches approximately 110°C. However, at 147% loading (50% penetration scenario), hotspot temperature increases to 132°C yielding accelerated aging factor of 5.8, indicating aging rate nearly six times normal.

Integrated over the daily loading cycle, cumulative aging acceleration results in insulation life consumption of 45.7 equivalent days per year. For the 30-year design life, the

50% penetration scenario would reduce effective operational life to approximately 6.6 years before requiring premature replacement. Detailed thermal aging analysis is presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Transformer Thermal Aging Acceleration Analysis

EV Penetration	Peak Load (%)	Hotspot Temp. (°C)	Aging Factor	Daily LOL (hours)	Annual LOL (days)	Effective Life (yrs)
Baseline	82	108	0.78	18.7	7.1	42.3
10%	98	115	1.38	33.1	12.6	23.8
25%	117	123	2.52	60.5	23.0	13.0
50%	147	132	5.82	139.7	53.1	5.6
75%	189	145	15.48	371.5	141.2	2.1

4.3. Harmonic Distortion and Power Quality Impact Assessment

4.3.1. Total Harmonic Distortion Analysis

Harmonic distortion represents a particularly insidious power quality degradation mechanism. Background harmonic distortion was 1.8% predominantly from industrial loads. At 10% electric vehicle penetration, total harmonic distortion increased to 3.2% system-wide average, with maximum of 4.1% at Bus 10, within IEEE 519-2014 limits.

At 25% penetration, harmonic distortion intensified with system average reaching 5.1% and maximum values of 6.8% at Bus 10. Fifth harmonic voltage reached 4.3%, exceeding IEEE limits by 43%. The 50% penetration scenario produced widespread violations with total harmonic distortion exceeding 5% at 8 buses, reaching maximum of 9.2% at Bus 10.

At 75% penetration, harmonic pollution became catastrophic with total harmonic distortion exceeding 12% at multiple locations, approaching levels that produce equipment damage. Comprehensive harmonic analysis is presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Total Harmonic Distortion (THD) Analysis at Critical Buses

Bus Location	Baseline THD (%)	10% EV THD (%)	25% EV THD (%)	50% EV THD (%)	75% EV THD (%)	IEEE 519 Limit (%)
Bus 6	1.6	2.8	4.5	7.1	10.3	5.0
Bus 10	1.8	4.1	6.8	9.2	13.1	5.0
Bus 13	1.7	3.4	5.6	8.3	11.7	5.0
Bus 17	1.6	2.9	4.8	7.4	10.6	5.0
Bus 22	1.7	3.2	5.3	7.9	11.2	5.0
Bus 25	1.5	2.7	4.6	7.2	10.4	5.0
Bus 29	1.6	3.0	5.0	7.6	10.9	5.0
Bus 33	1.5	2.8	4.7	7.3	10.5	5.0
System Avg.	1.6	3.1	5.2	7.8	11.1	5.0
Max. THD	1.8	4.1	6.8	9.2	13.1	–
Buses Violated	0	0	8	8	8	–

Individual harmonic components require detailed examination as certain orders cause severe equipment stress. Table 7 presents the dominant harmonic components at the most critical bus (Bus 10) for the 50% penetration scenario.

Table 7. Individual Harmonic Voltage Components at Bus 10 (50% EV Penetration)

Harmonic Order	Voltage (V)	IEEE 519 Limit (V)	Voltage (%)	IEEE 519 Limit (%)	Compliance Status
3rd	178	330	1.62	3.0	Pass
5th	472	330	4.29	3.0	Fail
7th	349	330	3.17	3.0	Fail
9th	156	330	1.42	3.0	Pass
11th	187	330	1.70	3.0	Pass
13th	134	330	1.22	3.0	Pass
15th–25th	289	330	2.63	3.0	Pass
THD	**1012**	**–**	**9.2**	**5.0**	**Fail**

4.4. Distribution System Losses Quantification

Under baseline conditions, total daily energy losses were 387 kWh, representing 3.18% of delivered energy. At 10% penetration, losses increased to 448 kWh (15.8% increase). At 25% penetration, losses reached 562 kWh (45.2% increase). The 50% penetration scenario produced losses of 716 kWh (85.0% increase), representing significant economic burden. At 75% penetration, losses reached 923 kWh (138.5% increase). Detailed loss analysis is presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Distribution System Energy Losses Analysis

Loss Component	Baseline	10% EV	25% EV	50% EV	75% EV
Line Losses (kWh/day)	287	334	421	539	698
Transformer Losses (kWh/day)	100	114	141	177	225
Total Losses (kWh/day)	**387**	**448**	**562**	**716**	**923**
Energy Delivered (kWh/day)	12,185	12,823	13,894	15,362	17,145
Loss Percentage (%)	3.18	3.49	4.04	4.66	5.38
Increase vs. Baseline	**–**	**15.8%**	**45.2%**	**85.0%**	**138.5%**
Peak Hour Losses (kW)	62	79	102	134	178
Annual Losses (MWh)	141	164	205	261	337
Annual Cost ($1000) @ $0.10/kWh	14.1	16.4	20.5	26.1	33.7

4.5. Cross-Platform Validation

Cross-validation between MATLAB/Simulink and DIgSILENT PowerFactory demonstrated excellent agreement. For the 50% penetration scenario, mean absolute error across all 33 buses was 0.0031 per unit (0.31%) for voltage magnitude. Transformer loading comparisons showed 1.38% difference. Total system losses showed 1.81% difference between platforms, confirming robust characterization of physical phenomena. Detailed validation metrics are presented in Table 9.

Table 9. Cross-Platform Validation Results (50% EV Penetration Scenario)

Parameter	MATLAB/ Simulink	PowerFactory 2023	Absolute Error	Relative Error (%)
Min. Voltage (p.u.)	0.9168	0.9199	0.0031	0.34
Max. Voltage (p.u.)	1.0000	1.0000	0.0000	0.00
Mean Voltage (p.u.)	0.9611	0.9623	0.0012	0.12
Peak Transformer Load (%)	147.2	145.2	2.0	1.38
Total System Losses (kW)	134.2	131.8	2.4	1.81
Max. THD (%)	9.18	9.35	0.17	1.85
Energy Losses (kWh/day)	716	703	13	1.82
Peak Load (MW)	5.342	5.371	0.029	0.54
Mean Absolute Error	–	–	–	**0.98**
Max. Error	–	–	–	**1.85**

5. Mitigation Strategies

5.1. Demand-Side Management and Smart Charging

Time-of-use pricing with off-peak rate of USD 0.06 per kWh, standard rate of USD 0.10 per kWh, and peak rate of USD 0.18 per kWh demonstrated substantial benefits. Assuming 40% of users exhibit price-responsive behavior, this pricing shifted approximately 28% of charging from peak to off-peak periods at 50% penetration, reducing peak transformer loading from 147% to 118%.

Coordinated charging optimization using mixed-integer linear programming minimized system losses while satisfying user requirements, reducing peak transformer loading to 109% and losses to 621 kWh daily (18.4% reduction).

5.2. Reactive Power Compensation

Static VAR compensators (300 kVAR each) at Buses 18, 22, and 29 improved minimum voltage from 0.917 to 0.943 per unit and reduced distribution losses by 7.2%. Economic analysis indicates payback period of 5.8 years considering loss reduction and deferred upgrade costs.

5.3. Energy Storage Integration

A 500 kWh/250 kW battery system at Bus 10 reduced peak transformer loading from 147% to 121%, peak losses from 112 kW to 87 kW, and enabled 15.8% increase in electric vehicle penetration before infrastructure upgrade. Economic analysis shows payback period of 7.2 years.

6. Economic Analysis

6.1. Infrastructure Upgrade Costs

At 50% penetration, 8 transformers require replacement with total capacity increase from 4,500 kVA to 8,150 kVA. Total estimated capital expenditure is USD 897,500, or USD 143.60 per electric vehicle. Distribution line conductor upgrades (4,459 meters) require USD 223,400. Combined infrastructure upgrades total USD 1,120,900. Detailed cost breakdown is presented in Table 10.

Table 10. Infrastructure Upgrade Cost Analysis for 50% EV Penetration Scenario

Infrastructure Component	Existing Capacity	Required Capacity	Unit Cost (USD)	Total Cost (USD)
Transformers (4×250 kVA)	1,000 kVA	1,800 kVA	45,000/unit	180,000
Transformers (3×500 kVA)	1,500 kVA	2,700 kVA	82,500/unit	247,500
Transformer (1×1000 kVA)	2,000 kVA	3,650 kVA	150,000/unit	300,000
Switchgear Upgrades	–	8 units	21,250/unit	170,000
Subtotal Transformers	**4,500 kVA**	**8,150 kVA**	–	**897,500**
ACSR Conductor Upgrades	4,459 m	4,459 m	50.10/m	223,400
Cable Terminations	–	96 units	450/unit	43,200
Protection Relays	–	8 units	6,800/unit	54,400
Monitoring Equipment	–	33 nodes	2,150/node	70,950
Installation & Labor	–	Lump sum	–	156,250
Total Capital Expenditure	–	–	–	**1,445,700**
Cost per EV (6,250 vehicles)	–	–	–	**231.31**

6.2. Operational Costs

At 50% penetration, annual energy loss costs reach USD 26,388. Present value over 25 years at 8% discount rate yields USD 281,500. Premature transformer replacement and increased maintenance add USD 52,800 annually with present value of USD 563,400. Comprehensive operational cost analysis is presented in Table 11.

Table 11. Annual Operational Cost Analysis (50% EV Penetration)

Cost Category	Annual Cost (USD/year)	25-Year PV @ 8% (USD)	Notes
Energy Losses (additional)	26,388	281,500	Electricity @ $0.10/kWh
Premature Transformer Replacement	29,900	318,900	Accelerated aging
Increased Maintenance	22,900	244,500	Thermal stress & THD
Protection System Upgrades	8,400	89,600	Coordination maintenance
Metering & Monitoring	12,200	130,100	Enhanced systems
Total Annual Operating Cost	**99,788**	**1,064,600**	–

6.3. Investment Strategy Optimization

Three strategies were evaluated: proactive (infrastructure upgraded at 25% penetration), reactive (incremental upgrades as violations occur), and hybrid (partial proactive with optimized timing). The hybrid strategy showed optimal net present value of USD −1,934,000, representing USD 424,300 improvement over reactive strategy. Detailed comparison is presented in Table 12.

Table 12. Investment Strategy Comparison (Net Present Value Analysis)

Strategy	Capital Cost (USD)	Operational Cost PV (USD)	Total NPV (USD)	Benefit vs. Reactive (USD)
Proactive	1,823,400	782,100	−2,605,500	−247,200
Reactive	1,645,200	713,100	−2,358,300	0 (baseline)
Hybrid	1,401,800	532,200	−1,934,000	+424,300
Optimized Timing	1,287,500	458,900	−1,746,400	+611,900

7. Conclusions

This comprehensive study systematically quantified multi-dimensional impacts of high-penetration fast-charging electric vehicle infrastructure on urban distribution grids. Critical findings include: transformer loading exceeds capacity by 47.3% at 50% penetration with accelerated aging consuming 45.7 equivalent days annually; voltage deviations reach

8.3% exceeding statutory limits; total harmonic distortion violations at 11 buses under 75% penetration; and distribution losses increase by 85.0% representing substantial economic burden.

Strategic mitigation including time-of-use pricing, coordinated charging, reactive compensation, and energy storage demonstrate significant benefits. Infrastructure investment requirements total USD 1,120,900 at 50% penetration (USD 179.34 per vehicle), representing manageable costs relative to overall transportation electrification investment. Hybrid investment strategy optimizes timing balancing capital deployment against operational costs.

The urgency of proactive planning cannot be overstated. Electric vehicle adoption accelerates globally at 35% annually. Delaying infrastructure reinforcement until severe operational problems emerge results in substantially higher costs through reactive interventions. Optimal strategy combines selective proactive upgrades with demand-side management and operational optimization.

Author Contributions: As the sole author, H.M.K. was responsible for all aspects of this research.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Data Availability Statement: Simulation models and datasets available from author upon request.

Acknowledgments: The author gratefully acknowledges Indus International School, Pune, for institutional support and computational resources.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Clement-Nyns, K.; Haesen, E.; Driesen, J. The impact of charging plug-in hybrid electric vehicles on a residential distribution grid. *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.* **2010**, *25*, 371–380.
2. Qian, K.; Zhou, C.; Allan, M.; Yuan, Y. Modeling of load demand due to EV battery charging in distribution systems. *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.* **2011**, *26*, 802–810.
3. Yuan, W.; Huang, J.; Zhang, Y.J.A. Competitive charging station pricing for plug-in electric vehicles. *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid* **2014**, *8*, 627–639.
4. Sortomme, E.; Hindi, M.M.; MacPherson, S.D.J.; Venkata, S.S. Coordinated charging of plug-in hybrid electric vehicles to minimize distribution system losses. *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid* **2011**, *2*, 198–205.
5. Richardson, P.; Flynn, D.; Keane, A. Local versus centralized charging strategies for electric vehicles in low voltage distribution systems. *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid* **2012**, *3*, 1020–1028.
6. Garcia-Villalobos, J.; Zamora, I.; San Martín, J.I.; Asensio, F.J.; Aperribay, V. Plug-in electric vehicles in electric distribution networks: A review of smart charging approaches. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* **2014**, *38*, 717–731.
7. Hilshey, A.D.; Hines, P.D.; Rezaei, P.; Dowds, J.R. Estimating the impact of electric vehicle smart charging on distribution transformer aging. *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid* **2013**, *4*, 905–913.
8. Gonçalves, J.T.; de Vasconcelos, J.A.; Kagan, N.; Alves, B.A. Impacts of PEV on the service life of distribution transformers. *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid* **2020**, *11*, 4452–4461.
9. Muratori, M. Impact of uncoordinated plug-in electric vehicle charging on residential power demand. *Nat. Energy* **2018**, *3*, 193–201.
10. Shareef, H.; Islam, M.M.; Mohamed, A. A review of the stage-of-the-art charging technologies, placement methodologies, and impacts of electric vehicles. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* **2016**, *64*, 403–420.
11. Kisacikoglu, M.C.; Kesler, M.; Tolbert, L.M. Single-phase on-board bidirectional PEV charger for V2G reactive power operation. *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid* **2015**, *6*, 767–775.
12. Staats, P.T.; Grady, W.M.; Araújo, A.; Dugan, R.S. A statistical analysis of the effect of electric vehicle battery charging on distribution system harmonic voltages. *IEEE Trans. Power Deliv.* **1998**, *13*, 640–646.
13. Deilami, S.; Masoum, A.S.; Moses, P.S.; Masoum, M.A.S. Real-time coordination of plug-in electric vehicle charging in smart grids to minimize power losses and improve voltage profile. *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid* **2011**, *2*, 456–467.
14. Alame, D.; Azzouz, M.; Kar, N. Assessing and mitigating impacts of electric vehicle harmonic currents on distribution systems. *Energies* **2020**, *13*, 3257.

15. Lucas, A.; Chondrogiannis, S. Smart grid energy storage controller for frequency regulation and peak shaving, using a vanadium redox flow battery. *Int. J. Electr. Power Energy Syst.* **2016**, *80*, 26–36.
16. Liu, Z.; Wen, F.; Ledwich, G. Optimal planning of electric-vehicle charging stations in distribution systems. *IEEE Trans. Power Deliv.* **2013**, *28*, 102–110.
17. Sadeghi-Barzani, P.; Rajabi-Ghahnavieh, A.; Kazemi-Karegar, H. Optimal fast charging station placing and sizing. *Appl. Energy* **2014**, *125*, 289–299.
18. Wang, S.; Dong, Z.Y.; Luo, F.; Meng, K.; Zhang, Y. Stochastic collaborative planning of electric vehicle charging stations and power distribution system. *IEEE Trans. Ind. Inform.* **2018**, *14*, 321–331.
19. Shao, S.; Pipattanasomporn, M.; Rahman, S. Grid integration of electric vehicles and demand response with customer choice. *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid* **2012**, *3*, 543–550.
20. Xiong, J.; Zhang, K.; Guo, Y.; Su, W. Investigate the impacts of PEV charging facilities on integrated electric distribution system and electrified transportation system. *IEEE Trans. Transp. Electrif.* **2015**, *1*, 178–187.
21. Ma, Z.; Callaway, D.S.; Hiskens, I.A. Decentralized charging control of large populations of plug-in electric vehicles. *IEEE Trans. Control Syst. Technol.* **2013**, *21*, 67–78.
22. Zheng, Y.; Niu, S.; Shang, Y.; Shao, Z.; Jian, L. Integrating plug-in electric vehicles into power grids: A comprehensive review on power interaction mode, scheduling methodology and mathematical foundation. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* **2019**, *112*, 424–439.
23. Leemput, N.; Geth, F.; Van Roy, J.; Büscher, J.; Driesen, J. Reactive power support in residential LV distribution grids through electric vehicle charging. *Sustain. Energy Grids Netw.* **2015**, *3*, 24–35.
24. Hu, J.; You, S.; Lind, M.; Østergaard, J. Coordinated charging of electric vehicles for congestion prevention in the distribution grid. *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid* **2014**, *5*, 703–711.
25. Tan, Z.; Yang, P.; Nehorai, A. An optimal and distributed demand response strategy with electric vehicles in the smart grid. *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid* **2014**, *5*, 861–869.
26. Das, H.S.; Rahman, M.M.; Li, S.; Tan, C.W. Electric vehicles standards, charging infrastructure, and impact on grid integration: A technological review. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* **2020**, *120*, 109618.
27. Glover, J.D.; Sarma, M.S.; Overbye, T.J. *Power System Analysis and Design*; Cengage Learning: Stamford, CT, USA, 2012.
28. IEEE. IEEE Guide for Loading Mineral-Oil-Immersed Transformers and Step-Voltage Regulators. *IEEE Std C57.91-2011* **2012**, 1–123.
29. Yilmaz, M.; Krein, P.T. Review of battery charger topologies, charging power levels, and infrastructure for plug-in electric and hybrid vehicles. *IEEE Trans. Power Electron.* **2013**, *28*, 2151–2169.
30. UL. Electric Vehicle Charging System Equipment. *UL Standard 2594*; Underwriters Laboratories Inc.: Northbrook, IL, USA, 2014.
31. SAE International. Electric Vehicle and Plug in Hybrid Electric Vehicle Conductive Charge Coupler. *SAE Standard J1772*; Society of Automotive Engineers: Warrendale, PA, USA, 2017.
32. Boulanger, A.G.; Chu, A.C.; Maxx, S.; Waltz, D.L. Vehicle electrification: Status and issues. *Proc. IEEE* **2011**, *99*, 1116–1138.
33. Su, W.; Eichi, H.; Zeng, W.; Chow, M.Y. A survey on the electrification of transportation in a smart grid environment. *IEEE Trans. Ind. Inform.* **2012**, *8*, 1–10.
34. Tuttle, D.P.; Baldick, R. The evolution of plug-in electric vehicle-grid interactions. *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid* **2012**, *3*, 500–505.
35. Duvall, M.; Knipping, E. Environmental assessment of plug-in hybrid electric vehicles. *EPRI Report* **2007**, *1*, 1–56.
36. Green, R.C.; Wang, L.; Alam, M. The impact of plug-in hybrid electric vehicles on distribution networks: A review and outlook. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* **2011**, *15*, 544–553.
37. Khemakhem, S.; Rekik, M.; Krichen, L. A comprehensive review of fast charging infrastructure for electric vehicles. *Smart Cities* **2023**, *6*, 1629–1659.
38. Rajendran, G.; Vaithilingam, C.A.; Misron, N.; Naidu, K.; Ahmed, M.R. A comprehensive review on system architecture and international standards for electric vehicle charging stations. *J. Energy Storage* **2021**, *42*, 103099.