

AD-A076 117

INSTITUTE FOR ACOUSTICAL RESEARCH MIAMI FLA
EFFECTS OF OCEAN FRONTS ON MULTIPATH VERTICAL ANGLES AND THE AS--ETC(U)
JUL 79 R P FLANAGAN , X ZABALGOGEAZCOA
IAR-79002


F/G 20/1

N00014-74-C-0229

NL

UNCLASSIFIED

1 OF 1
AD-
A076117



END
DATE
FILMED

11-79
DDC

LEVEL

#12

**INSTITUTE FOR ACOUSTICAL RESEARCH
MIAMI DIVISION PALISADES GEOPHYSICAL INSTITUTE**

AD A 076117

EFFECTS OF OCEAN FRONTS ON MULTIPATH
VERTICAL ANGLES AND THE ASSOCIATED
BIASES IN ARRAY BEARING ESTIMATION*

R.P. Flanagan and X. Zabalgogezcoa

Institute for Acoustical Research
615 Southwest Second Avenue
Miami, Florida 33130

July 1979

Handwritten signature and initials

DDC
RECEIVED
NOV 5 1979
A

DDC FILE COPY

IAR 79002

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release
Distribution Unlimited

Miami, Florida 33130

79 11 05 042

EFFECTS OF OCEAN FRONTS ON MULTIPATH
VERTICAL ANGLES AND THE ASSOCIATED
BIASES IN ARRAY BEARING ESTIMATION*

R.P. Flanagan and X. Zabalgoeazcoa

Institute for Acoustical Research
615 Southwest Second Avenue
Miami, Florida 33130

July 1979

IAR 79002



ABSTRACT

EFFECTS OF OCEAN FRONTS ON MULTIPATH VERTICAL ANGLES
AND THE ASSOCIATED BIASES IN ARRAY BEARING ESTIMATION

R.P. Flanagan and X. Zabalgoeazcoa

An oceanic frontal system perpendicular to the propagation path is modeled with a deep receiver in warm water and a shallow source which is moved through the frontal system into progressively colder water. A ray model is used to calculate the arrival structure and determine the effects of the frontal system on ray amplitude and vertical angle. The receiving horizontal line array determines the bias in bearing estimation resulting from the changing multipath structure. This bias is found to be heavily dependent on array orientation and range into the frontal system while being only slightly dependent on array beamwidth. The underlying physics causing the multipath variations is the frontal system acting as a focusing lens. When the transducer positions are reversed, that is a deep receiver in cold water and a shallow source in progressively warmer water, the frontal system acts as a diverging lens.

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DDC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Dist	Available for special

Introduction

The propagation of sound through oceanic fronts is a topic of interest due to the frequent appearance of these systems in the world oceans. Typically an ocean front may be visualized as a well defined transition region between two volumes of water with characteristic sound velocity distributions. One of the effects of such a region in a propagation path is the alteration of the multipath structure of the received signal; in fact an oceanic front may act as an acoustic lens with either convergent or dispersive characteristics depending on the direction of transmission. Since source bearing estimation with a linear array is highly dependent on the vertical structure of the acoustic paths at the sensors one of the major effects of an oceanic front is the introduction of biased bearing estimation. The object of this paper is the determination of the magnitude of this bias for a typical frontal system anomaly.

In this study ray tracing techniques applied to an ocean with vertical and horizontal variations in the sound velocity profile have been used to analyze the effect of a frontal system on acoustic transmission. The bulk of the material is concerned with a source located in progressively colder water propagating a 200 Hz CW signal through the frontal system to a warm water array. After the multipath structure, arrival angle, bearing estimation and bias are thoroughly presented for this transducer geometry the positions of the source and receiver are

reversed and a brief examination of the frontal effects is made. In both cases the bias in bearing estimation introduced by the frontal system was found to be a function of range, beamwidth, and directional orientation of the array.

I. The Frontal System

An oceanic front may be defined as the transition region which divides water masses of different physical characteristics with the surface positions of the fronts being marked by strong horizontal temperature gradients. These fronts tend to remain in one area, but can exhibit severe variations within that area.¹⁻² A general outline of the frontal systems of the world oceans along with their seasonal positions is given by Laevastu and LaFond.³ Work on specific systems includes Levenson and Doblar⁴ for the North Atlantic, Roden⁵ for the North Pacific and Bannister, et. al.⁶ for the South Tasman Sea.

The system we have chosen to model is bi-frontal and extends from warm to cold water regions, (Fig. 1). Proceeding from warm to cold water the first region has a profile with a negative gradient extending from the surface to the SOFAR axis. The profile for the second region has a near isovelocity layer extending from the surface to 150 m. Beyond that depth the sound velocities gradually merge to form an elevated SOFAR axis. The area separating these two regions is termed the first front and is 50 km wide. The third region contains the coldest water and has a near isovelocity layer in the upper 200 m joined to a positive gradient below that depth. The second front, which separates regions 2 and 3, is also 50 km wide. Because of the imaginary location of the receiving array, and thus its variability in range, it is possible to examine the propagation of sound for both the single and double front cases.

The top half of Fig. 1 shows the location of the fronts with range. The receiver is at 2100 m in the warm water profile while the 100 m deep source was placed at ranges varying from 700 to 1125 km. Each region has a range independent sound velocity while the fronts contain the transition profiles between surrounding regions.

The fronts are taken to be perpendicular to the propagation path. If this is not the case horizontal refraction takes place and the rays propagate out of the vertical plane indicating a source of bearing bias which will not be examined here. Finally, the width of the front will affect the bias in bearing estimation. Calculations with a front width of 5 km showed rapid oscillations of this bias with range. This occurs because the rays alternately sample and miss the front since the anomaly decreases in amplitude with depth and the rays may therefore pass under it at certain ranges.

II. The Ray Model

The ray model used for this study is described elsewhere⁷ and is capable of tracing rays in a medium with vertical and horizontal variations in the sound speed profile. The basic profile consisted of four pieces with a linear bottom section, two hyperbolic cosines for the SOFAR region, and a surface section with a sound velocity distribution that yields a conic ray path. The horizontal variation of the profiles occurred only in the two frontal regions with range steps of 100 m. The bottom was assumed to be flat and lossy to limit the significant arrivals to refracted-refracted (RR) and refracted-surface reflected (RSR) rays. The corresponding profiles and profile anomalies are shown in the lower half of Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 respectively. It can be seen that the anomalies for these two fronts are similar in general form.

III. The Array Reception Model

The receiving array was modeled as a horizontal linear set of phones. In order to avoid specifying the number, separation distances, and shading of the phones, the calculations were performed for 3 dB beamwidths of 1° , 2° and 5° with $\sin x/x$ weightings. The range of beamwidths was based on the examination of several papers on arrays a few of which are ref. 8-11. Typically beamwidth broadens when passing from broadside to endfire aspects so the results for the different beamwidths can be mixed to more accurately depict this. The array reception as a function of array axis orientation with respect to the frontal system was simulated. The array axis was rotated from a position parallel to the fronts to the perpendicular position in 1° increments. For each array orientation the array response as a function of azimuth (θ) was obtained by means of the incoherent beamformer.

$$P(\theta) = \int_0^L \sum_{n=1}^N A_n \exp\{j[\underline{k}_n(\theta_s, \mu_n) - \underline{k}_o(\theta)] \cdot \underline{x}\} dx$$

where A_n and \underline{k}_n are the amplitudes and vector wave numbers of the N paths determined by the ray tracing model, μ_n is the vertical elevation of the paths, \underline{k}_o is the horizontal array steering vector and L is a parameter that adjusts the desired beamwidth.

The geometry of the array is shown in Fig. 3. The main lobe corresponding to a steering to azimuth θ_o is

shown as a figure of revolution about the array axis. If a source is located at azimuth θ_s only rays reaching the array with vertical arrival angles between μ_{MIN} and μ_{MAX} will be processed in the beamformer output.

Figures 4 and 5 show vertical angle of arrival vs bearing (0° being endfire) for 1° and 5° beamwidths. From these plots it is possible to obtain a bearing estimate. The two horizontal lines on Fig. 5 indicate arrivals with vertical angles of 7.5° and 15° . Let the vertical line at 20° bearing represent the true bearing of the source. The intersection of these lines at points A and B may be continued to the bearing axis by the dashed lines. Apparent bearings of 21.25° and 25° yield biases of 1.2° and 5° for the two rays. If equi-amplitude rays are chosen then an averaging process can be used to set the bias at 3.1° . If the true bearing is 50° the points C and D convert to biases of $.3^\circ$ and 1.8° with an average of 1.0° . From the comparison of these two examples it can be seen that this bias is a function of array orientation with the largest biases occurring in the endfire aspect.

If ray amplitudes are different another method of determining the bias in bearing estimate is needed. These characteristics necessitated the incoherent summation of the rays over a specified beamwidth and weighting function described previously. A three dimensional plot of array energy vs true bearing from

array vs apparent bearing from array yields a visual representation of the bias in bearing estimation as will be shown for the specific front process.

IV. The Computer Simulation

The ray model was run at various ranges before the fronts and in the fronts. The ranges within the frontal region were also run without the frontal effects in order to examine the changes that the fronts had caused. All of the data was examined with beamwidths of 1° , 2° and 5° .

As an example, three dimensional plots and the resultant bearing bias vs true bearing diagrams are given for ranges of 875 and 910 km and a 1° beamwidth. Figure 1 shows these two ranges to be in the center of and 10 km after the first front respectively. Figures 6 and 7 represent the array response for these ranges without the fronts, and Figs. 8 and 9 depict the complementary data but include the frontal effects. Figure 10 depicts the bias in bearing for each of the four cases above. Examining Fig. 6 with a bearing of source from array of 0° , three peaks are observed at apparent bearings of 9.5° , 11.1° , and 13.6° . These peaks represent the energy from ray pairs, each pair with the same number of cycles between the source and receiver and consisting of a positive and negative angle at the source. It is apparent that a horizontal array in the endfire aspect, with a beamwidth and directional increment of $.1^\circ$ can separate ray arrivals with vertical angle differences of twice the beamwidth if the array operates as presumed. As the array is moved towards broadside the ability to separate ray arrivals is lost. This is observable from

Fig. 4 as the range of vertical angle increases for constant bearing as bearing is increased. Returning to Fig. 6 we define the apparent bearing (bearing estimate) of the source from the array as the point of maximum energy; then 11.1° is the bearing bias. Naturally it is desirable to make the bias as small as possible and we would like to pick the peak at 9.5° . This could be accomplished if we used the first deviation from zero as apparent bearing is increased, however it may not be possible to determine if it is single or multiple sources creating the multi-bearing readings.

Comparing Fig. 6 with 8 and Fig. 7 with 9 we can examine the effects of the first front. There appears to be more energy for the frontal cases, and it is shifted towards the lower end of the apparent bearing axis reducing the bearing bias. This is also indicated in Fig. 10. Figures 11 and 12 show the amplitudes of the positive source angle rays which reach the array with vertical angle θ_R for the cases without the front and with the front respectively. The arrival sets are shown for different ranges and the location of these points with respect to the frontal regions can be determined from Fig. 1. Examining the two Figs. at 875 km and 910 km there is a definite increase in the number of arrivals and a decrease in θ_R for the arrivals when the effects of the frontal region are included.

One simple case is presented in the Appendix showing transmission from cold to warm water through a front focuses the multipath structure. That is, rays from the cold water which interacted with the surface will not reach the surface in warmer waters. Therefore, the acoustics with the cold to warm water front and these approximate source and receiver depths should support more RR type rays with higher cycle number and lower θ_R than the acoustics without the front.

Figure 13 depicts the arrival pattern for the positive source angles before the fronts from 750 km to 850 km. It is possible to detect trends in this pattern. If the bases of the rays are joined in the 760 km to 810 km ranges a shape is formed similar to the greek letter μ with the final tail clipped off. Figure 14 is an expansion of the previous figure including ranges from 750 km to 1100 km without the frontal process. Each μ shape here represents rays with the same cycle number as indicated on the figure. Because there are no horizontal variations, i.e., profile 1 is used throughout, the angles may be found where propagation type changes from RR to RSR to SRBR. These divisions are indicated on the plot. A rough approximation of spreading loss can be determined by examining $dR/d\theta_R$ of each curve. Large values of this derivative indicate low amplitudes while small values indicate large amplitudes. Therefore, the amplitudes of the RR ray types increase as θ_R decreases. The RSR rays have low amplitudes at the transition regions and large amplitudes in the "valley"

regions indicated in the figure. Further, because $dR/d\theta_R$ is larger there, the RSR rays on the left side of the valley have lower amplitude than those on the right. The SRBR rays have consistently high losses due to spreading which are further magnified by the bottom losses, so these rays will not be mentioned any further. Using this figure it is possible to determine the number and type of ray solutions at a given range. For example, at 900 km the arrival set consists of a 16 cycle RR ray and two 16 cycle RSR rays. At 1040 km the arrival set contains one RR and two RSR rays with 18 cycles and the same types with 19 cycles.

The bias in bearing estimation can be examined using this figure and the general rule that an increase in vertical angle causes an increase in bearing bias. Starting at 750 km and increasing range the angle of the arrival with the largest amplitude at each range will indicate the bearing bias. From 750 km to 850 km at 10 km intervals the angles are: 8.8, 10.5, 8.2, 8.3, 8.5, 9.7, 8.8, 11.1, 8.3, 8.4, 8.6 degrees. The pattern here consists of a jump in angle followed by a smooth rise to the next jump followed by a smooth rise. This data is presented as a part of Fig. 15. The dashed lines mark the boundaries of the indicated cycle number. The constant slope is the RR region while the peak is formed by the RSR ray. From Fig. 14 it can be seen that the peak formed by the 13 cycle RR ray does not

continue into the valley formed by the 14 cycle RSR ray therefore, there is a large change in the vertical angle for the 13 cycle ray as shown in Fig. 15. Prior to 750 km this peak is presented in each ray cycle. As range is increased beyond 1100 km the peak formed by the N cycle RR ray reaches further into the valley of the N+1 cycle RR ray and ultimately the RR rays dominate the vertical angle and thus the bearing bias. At that range the plot similar to Fig. 15 should consist of only the small slopes. As the beam reaches broadside the bias in bearing estimation decreases rapidly.

Unfortunately, Figs. 14 and 15 are not as readily constructed for the cases including the fronts. The arrival pattern is available for only the specific ranges examined. The bias in bearing estimate is presented for 1° and 5° beamwidths in Tables 1, 2 and 3. Fig. 16 presents the bearing bias at endfire for the sampled ranges. From 750 km to 850 km a pattern similar to that in Fig. 15 is present but once the fronts are encountered the data is not sampled finely enough to discern a new pattern. However, it can be seen that the first front does decrease the bias as predicted by the focusing effect.

The multipath vertical angle pattern for the acoustics passing through both fronts is presented in the upper portion of Fig. 12. It can be seen that the number of arrivals has increased and there are several

rays with lower vertical angles at the receiver when compared to the multipath passing through the first front only. Figure 16 includes the bearing bias at endfire for ranges into the 2nd front. Although the decrease in bias is not as smooth as at the first front it does exist indicating a continuing focusing of the multipath structure.

We will now briefly examine the effects of the same frontal system on propagation between a shallow source in warm water and a deep receiver in cold water. The multipath structure as a function of range is shown in Fig. 17. A repeating pattern is present up to 1090 km indicating the passage of the source through the first front (front 2 in Figs. 1 and 16) has done little to affect the propagation. However, as the source passes through the second front (front 1 in Figs. 1 and 16) a significant change in the multipath structure takes place. The major arrival pair changes its vertical angle at the receiver from 3° to 6° . Thus the frontal system combined with this source and receiver orientation acts as a weak dispersive lens once the source is in the warm water. Figure 18 depicts the bias in the bearing estimate at the endfire aspect for receivers located in both warm and cold water. The different patterns in the bias for the two cases are present from 750 to 850 km. Beyond the second front the bias has decreased 5° for the warm water receiver while it has increased 3° for the cold water receiver.

V. Results and Conclusions

The effect of an ocean front on the multipath vertical angles and the associated bias in bearing estimation was found to be highly dependent of array orientation. At endfire the maximum bias was 11° while beyond 30° from endfire the bias was reduced to less than 2° for the various ranges and frontal conditions examined. The bias was found to exhibit a somewhat periodic pattern with range with the amplitudes of the variations decreasing with increasing range. Beamwidth was found to affect the bias in bearing estimate to a lesser degree and the apparent bearing of the source was always directed towards broadside.

It was also found that the frontal system acted as a convergent or dispersive lens depending on the direction of propagation. For a warm water receiver the frontal system decreased the bias in the bearing estimate at endfire by 5° while this bias was increased by 3° for a cold water receiver. It was further shown that a narrow beamwidth horizontal array should be able to separate individual multipath arrivals at endfire.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by the Office of Naval Research, Code 222.

APPENDIX

Multipath sound propagation through a cold to warm water front, subscripted c and w respectively, will undergo a focusing effect when the ray passes under the anomaly.

Referring to Fig. A1, the ray travels from cold to warm water, passing under the anomaly of depth z_A . Here z_{v_w} and z_{v_c} refer to the vertex depths near the surface.

Because

$$C_c = C_w; \theta_c = \theta_w \text{ and } C_{v_c} = C_{v_w} \quad (A1)$$

it is apparent from the diagram that

$$z_{v_w} > z_{v_c}. \quad (A2)$$

1° Beamwidth

Range	Bearing of Source from Array								
	0	6	12	18	24	30	36	42	48
850	8.6	4.5	2.8	1.9	1.5	1.1	.9	.8	.8
875	11.1	6.6	4.4	3.1	2.1	1.6	1.4	1.1	.9
910	8.7	4.7	2.8	2.0	1.5	1.1	1.0	.9	.8
1065	8.6	4.5	2.7	1.8	1.4	1.1	.9	.8	.8
1090	11.1	4.8	3.0	2.1	1.8	1.5	1.3	1.1	.9
1125	8.7	4.6	2.8	1.9	1.4	1.1	.9	.8	.7

5° Beamwidth

Range	Bearing of Source from Array								
	0	6	12	18	24	30	36	42	48
850	9.3	5.5	3.7	2.7	2.1	1.6	1.3	1.1	.9
875	10.8	6.4	4.3	3.0	2.3	1.8	1.5	1.3	1.1
910	9.3	5.5	3.8	2.6	2.0	1.7	1.3	1.0	.9
1065	9.5	5.7	3.8	2.8	2.2	1.7	1.4	1.1	.9
1090	10.2	5.8	3.8	2.7	2.1	1.7	1.3	1.1	.9
1125	9.6	5.9	4.0	3.0	2.3	1.8	1.5	1.3	.9

Table 1 - Bearing Bias : No Fronts

1° Beamwidth

Range	Bearing of Source from Array								
	0	6	12	18	24	30	36	42	48
850	8.6	4.5	2.8	1.9	1.5	1.1	.9	.8	.8
875	6.2	2.8	1.7	1.2	.9	.7	.7	.6	.5
910	4.8	1.8	1.2	.8	.7	.5	.4	.3	.3
1065	5.3	2.0	.9	.5	.5	.4	.3	.3	.3
1090	3.1	.6	.4	.3	.3	.2	.2	.2	.1
1125	3.1	.8	.5	.4	.4	.4	.3	.3	.3

5° Beamwidth

Range	Bearing of Source from Array								
	0	6	12	18	24	30	36	42	48
850	9.3	5.5	3.7	2.7	2.1	1.6	1.3	1.1	.9
875	7.3	3.7	2.5	1.8	1.4	1.1	.9	.7	.6
910	5.9	2.2	1.6	1.3	1.0	.8	.7	.5	.5
1065	4.3	1.9	1.4	1.1	.9	.7	.6	.5	.4
1090	3.4	1.2	.8	.7	.6	.5	.4	.3	.3
1125	4.6	2.1	1.5	1.3	1.0	.8	.7	.6	.5

Table 2 - Bearing Bias : Fronts

Range	Bearing of Source from Array								
	0	6	12	18	24	30	36	42	48
750	8.8	4.7	2.9	2.0	1.5	1.1	1.0	.8	.8
760	10.6	6.1	3.8	2.7	2.0	1.6	1.3	1.1	.8
770	8.2	4.2	2.5	1.8	1.3	1.1	.9	.7	.6
780	8.4	4.4	2.7	1.9	1.4	1.1	.9	.8	.7
790	8.6	4.5	2.8	1.9	1.4	1.1	.9	.8	.7
800	8.7	4.6	2.8	2.0	1.5	1.1	1.0	.8	.8
810	8.8	4.7	2.9	2.1	1.6	1.1	1.0	.8	.8
820	11.2	6.7	4.3	2.9	2.1	1.6	1.3	1.1	.9
830	8.4	4.3	2.6	1.8	1.4	1.1	.9	.8	.7
840	8.5	4.4	2.7	1.9	1.4	1.1	.9	.8	.8

5° Beamwidth

Range	Bearing of Source from Array								
	0	6	12	18	24	30	36	42	48
750	9.5	5.7	3.9	2.8	2.2	1.7	1.4	1.1	.9
760	10.5	6.1	4.0	2.8	2.2	1.7	1.4	1.1	.9
770	8.8	4.7	3.1	2.2	1.7	1.3	1.1	.9	.7
780	9.2	5.2	3.5	2.6	2.0	1.6	1.3	1.0	.9
790	9.3	5.3	3.5	2.5	1.9	1.5	1.2	1.0	.8
800	9.4	5.5	3.7	2.7	2.1	1.6	1.3	1.1	.9
810	9.5	5.6	3.8	2.8	2.2	1.7	1.3	1.1	.9
820	10.7	6.3	4.1	3.0	2.3	1.8	1.4	1.2	.9
830	9.1	5.1	3.4	2.5	1.9	2.3	1.2	1.0	.8
840	9.3	5.4	3.7	2.7	2.1	2.5	1.3	1.1	.9

Table 3 - Bearing Bias : Before Fronts

REFERENCES

* Part of this paper was presented at the 95th Meeting of the Acoustical Society of America, Providence, R.I.



1. R.W. James, Criticality of Ocean Fronts to ASW Operations, NAVOCEANO Technical Note 7700-3-72, 1 Sept. 1972.
2. G. Neumann and W. Pierson, Jr., Principles of Physical Oceanography, Prentice Hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1966.
3. T. Laevastu and E.C. LaFond, Oceanic Fronts and Their Seasonal Positions on the Surface, Naval Undersea Research and Development Center, Technical Publication NUC TP 204, October 1970.
4. C. Levenson and R.A. Doblar, "Long-range Acoustic Propagation through the Gulf Stream", J. Acoust. Soc. Am., 59, 1134-1141 (1976).
5. G.I. Roden, "Oceanic Subarctic Fronts of the Central Pacific: Structure of and Response to Atmospheric Forcing", J. Phys. Ocean., 7, 761-778 (1977).
6. R.W. Bannister, R.N. Denham, K.M. Guthrie, and D.G. Browning, "Project TASMAN TWO: Low-Frequency Propagation Measurements in the South Tasman Sea", J. Acoust. Soc. Am., 62, 847-859 (1977).
7. N.L. Weinberg and X. Zabalgogeoazcoa, "Coherent Ray Propagation through a Gulf Stream Ring", J. Acoust. Soc. Am., 62, 888-894 (1977).

8. F.N. Spiess, B. Luyendyk, M.S. Loughridge, "Bottom Slope Distributions and Implied Acoustic Bearing Errors in Abyssal Hill Regions of the North Pacific", J. of Underwater Acoustics, 183-196 (1969) Unclassified.
9. T.W. Sjoding, "Some Beam-steering Properties of Discretely Phased Symmetric Arrays", J. Acoust. Soc. Am., 54, 1347-1351 (1973).
10. D.D. Baker, D.A. Smith, "Study of the Measurement of Transducer Directivity with a Planar Measurement Array", J. Acoust. Soc. Am., 58, 807-811 (1975).
11. C.M. McKinney, R.H. Wallace, "Underwater Sound Transducer Beam Control with Reflectors", J. Acoust. Soc. Am., 55, 1190-1196 (1974).

List of Figures

<u>Figure #</u>	<u>Caption</u>
1	Location of fronts, source, and receiver; and sound speed profiles.
2	Sound speed profile anomalies.
3	Geometry of array.
4	Vertical angle of arrival vs bearing for 1° beamwidth.
5	Vertical angle of arrival vs bearing for 5° beamwidth.
6	Array energy vs bearing vs apparent bearing at 875 km without fronts for 1° beamwidth
7	Array energy vs bearing vs apparent bearing at 910 km without fronts for 1° beamwidth
8	Array energy vs bearing vs apparent bearing at 875 km with fronts for 1° beamwidth.
9	Array energy vs bearing vs apparent bearing at 910 km with fronts for 1° beamwidth.
10	Bias in bearing estimation vs bearing of source from array for cases of Figs. 6-9.
11	Amplitude of arrival vs vertical angle at receiver θ_R , at various ranges without frontal effects. Amplitudes plotted with linear scale.
12	Amplitude of arrival vs vertical angle at receiver, θ_R , at various ranges with frontal effects. Amplitudes plotted with linear scale.

- 13 Amplitude of arrival vs vertical angle at receiver, θ_R , from 750 to 850 km at 10 km intervals before the fronts. Amplitudes plotted with linear scale.
- 14 Multipath structure as a function of range and vertical angle at the receiver without frontal effects.
- 15 Vertical angle of largest amplitude arrival vs range without frontal effects.
- 16 Bias in bearing estimation at endfire for various ranges and beamwidths with and without frontal effects.
- 17 Amplitude of arrival vs vertical angle at receiver, θ_R , at various ranges with frontal effects. Amplitudes plotted with linear scale. Cold water receiver and warm water source.
- 18 Bias in bearing estimation and endfire for various ranges with frontal effects for both warm and cold water receivers.
- A1 Simple case for focusing of multipath structure.



FRONTAL SYSTEM GEOMETRY AND SOUND SPEED PROFILES

FIG. 1




FIG. 2




FIG. 3




FIG. 4





FIG. 5

RANGE 875 KM
NO FRONTS
1° BEAMWIDTH



APPARENT BEARING OF SOURCE FROM ARRAY

FIG. 6

RANGE 910 Km.
NO FRONTS
1° BEAMWIDTH




FIG. 7





FIG. 8

RANGE 910 KM.
FRONTS
1° BEAMWIDTH



APPARENT BEARING OF SOURCE FROM ARRAY

FIG. 9




FIG. 10




FIG. II




FIG. 12




FIG. 13




FIG. 14





FIG. 15



BIAS IN BEARING ESTIMATION AT ENDFIRE

FIG. 16





FIG. 17

• RECEIVER IN WARM WATER
◉ RECEIVER IN COLD WATER



BIAS IN BEARING ESTIMATION AT ENDFIRE
RANGE FROM RECEIVER (KM)
FIG. 18

UNCLASSIFIED DISTRIBUTION LIST

	<u>Copies</u>
Office of Naval Research 800 North Quincy Street Arlington, Virginia 22217 Attn: Code 222	2
102B	1
480	1
486	1
210	1
220	1
Director Naval Research Laboratory 4555 Overlook Avenue, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20375 Attn: Dr. J.P. Dugan	1
Dr. D.R. Palmer	1
Dr. J.C. Munson	1
Mr. R.R. Rojas	1
Dr. B.B. Adams	1
Dr. W.B. Moseley	1
Unclassified Library	1
Superintendent Naval Research Laboratory Underwater Sound Reference Division P.O. Box 8337 Orlando, Florida 32806	1
Director Office of Naval Research Branch Office 1030 East Green Street Pasadena, California 91106	1
Office of Naval Research Rm 239, Campbell Hall University of California Berkeley, Calif. 94720	1
Director Office of Naval Research Branch Office 495 Summer Street Boston, Massachusetts 02210	1
Office of Naval Research New York Area Office 715 Broadway - 5th Floor New York, New York 10003	1
Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Branch Office Box 39 FPO New York 09510	1

UNCLASSIFIED DISTRIBUTION LIST

Director Office of Naval Research Branch Office 536 South Clark Street Chicago, Illinois 60605	1
Office of Naval Research Resident Representative University District Building, Rm 422 1107 N.E. 45th Street Seattle, Washington 98105	1
Office of Naval Research Resident Representative Lamont-Doherty Geological Observatory Palisades, New York 10964	1
Technical Director Naval Oceanographic R&D Agency NSTL Station Bay St. Louis, Mississippi 39522	
Att: Dr. Ralph Goodman	1
Mr. E. Smith	1
CDR J.E. Paquin	1
Mr. K.W. Lackie	1
Mr. R. Van Wyckhouse	1
Dr. S.W. Marshall	1
Mr. G. Lewis	1
Director Naval Oceanographic Office NSTL Station Bay St. Louis, Mississippi 39522	
Attn: Dr. B.E. Olson	1
Dr. T.M. Davis	1
Mr. W.H. Geddes	1
Mr. M.K. Schank	1
Mr. R.A. Peloquin	1
Mr. R. Merrifield	1
Dr. W. Jobst	1
Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Engineering and Systems Rm 4E732, Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20350	1
Chief of Naval Operations Rm. 4E482, Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20350 Attn: Naval Oceanography Division (OP952)	1
Chief of Naval Operations Rm. 5D616, Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20350 Attn: Mr. R. Winokur, OP095E	1

UNCLASSIFIED DISTRIBUTION LIST

Chief of Naval Operations Rm 5D580, Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20350 Attn: OP951F	1
Chief of Naval Operations Rm. 4D518, Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20350 Attn: Capt. J.M. Van Metre	1
Chief of Naval Operations Office of the Director Naval Oceanographic Division OP-952 Department of the Navy Washington, D.C. 20352 Attn: Dr. R.W. James	1
Commander Oceanographic System, Atlantic Box 100 Norfolk, Virginia 23511	1
Commander Oceanographic System, Pacific Box 1390 Pearl Harbor, Hawaii 96860	1
Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency 1400 Wilson Blvd. Arlington, Virginia 22209 Attn: Dr. R. Gustafson	1
ARPA Research Center Moffett Field Unit #1 California 94035 Attn: Mr. E. Smith	1
Commanding Officer Fleet Weather Central Box 113 Pearl Harbor, Hawaii 96860 Attn: CDR C. Dunlop	1
Naval Ocean Systems Center (Kaneohe) Kaneohe, Hawaii 96863 Attn: Mr. D. Hightower Mr. B. Kishimoto	2
Commander Naval Electronic Systems Command 2511 Jefferson Davis Highway National Center #1 Arlington, Virginia 20360 Attn: Capt H. Cox, PME 124 CDR D. Griffith, NAVELEX 320	2

UNCLASSIFIED DISTRIBUTION LIST

Commander Naval Air Systems Command Jefferson Plaza #1 1411 Jefferson Davis Highway Arlington, Virginia 20360	1
Commander Naval Sea Systems Command National Center #2 2521 Jefferson Davis Highway Arlington, Virginia 20362 Attn: SEA 037 Mr. Carey Smith, 06H1 CDR David F. Bolka, 06H2 SEA 003	1 1 1 1
Commanding Officer Fleet Numerical Weather Central Monterey, California 93940 Attn: Mr. Paul Stevens Dr. D.R. McLain (NMFS)	1 1
Defense Documentation Center Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314	12
Director of Navy Laboratories Chief of Naval Material 2211 Jefferson Davis Highway Crystal Plaza #5 Arlington, Virginia 20360 Attn: Dr. James Probus, NAVMAT 08T1 Dr. Tibor Horwath, NAVMAT 08T2	2
Commander Naval Ocean Systems Center Department of the Navy San Diego, Calif. 92132 Attn: Dr. Daniel Andrews Dr. Dean Hanna Mr. Henry Aurand Dr. Harry A. Schenck	4
Commander Naval Surface Weapons Center Acoustics Division Silver Spring, Maryland 20910 Attn: Dr. Zaka Slawsky	1
Commander Naval Surface Weapons Center Science and Mathematics Research Group (K05) Dahlgren, Virginia 22448 Attn: Dr. E.W. Schwiderski	1

UNCLASSIFIED DISTRIBUTION LIST

Commanding Officer Naval Underwater Systems Center New London Laboratory New London, Connecticut 06320 Attn: Dr. W. Von Winkle Dr. A. Nuttall Mr. A. Ellinthorpe Dr. D.M. Viccione Mr. A. Donn Cobb Mr. R. Hasse	6
Commander Naval Air Development Center Department of the Navy Warminster, Pennsylvania 18974 Attn: Keith Jerome, Proj. Eng.	1
Commanding Officer Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory Panama City, Florida 32401 Attn: Unclassified Library	1
Commanding Officer Naval Underwater Systems Center Newport Laboratory Newport, Rhode Island 02840 Attn: Unclassified Library	1
Commander Naval Ship R&D Center Bethesda, Maryland 20034 Attn: Dr. M. Sevik	1
Commander David W. Taylor Naval Ship R&D Center Bethesda, Maryland 20084	1
Superintendent Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940	1
Superintendent U.S. Naval Academy Annapolis, Maryland 21402 Attn: Library	1
Commanding Officer Naval Intelligence Support Center 4301 Suitland Road Washington, D.C. 20390 Attn: Dr. Johann Martinek Mr. E. Bissett NISC 34	3

UNCLASSIFIED DISTRIBUTION LIST

Director Applied Physics Laboratory University of Washington 1013 N.E. 40th Street Seattle, Washington 98105 Attn: Dr. T.E. Ewart Dr. M. Schulkin	2
Applied Research Laboratories University of Texas at Austin P.O. Box 8029 10000 FM Road 1325 Austin, Texas 78712 Attn: Dr. Loyd Hampton Dr. Charles Wood	2
Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Physics Scripps Institute of Oceanography University of California La Jolla, California 92093 Attn: Dr. W. Munk Mr. J. Spiesberger Dr. V.C. Anderson	3
Dr. Melvin J. Jacobson Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Troy, New York 12181	1
Dr. T.G. Birdsall Cooley Electronics Laboratory University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105	1
Dr. M.A. Basin S.D.P. Inc 15250 Ventura Blvd. Suite 518 Sherman Oaks, Calif. 91403	1
University of Miami Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences 4600 Rickenbacker Causeway Miami, Florida 33149 Attn: Dr. H. DeFerrari Dr. W. Duing	2
Dr. David Middleton 127 East 91st Street New York, New York 10028	1

UNCLASSIFIED DISTRIBUTION LIST

Dr. Donald Tufts University of Rhode Island Department of Electrical Eng. Wakefield, Rhode Island 02881	1
Dr. Loren Nolte Duke University Department of Electrical Engineering Durham, North Carolina 27706	1
Mr. S.W. Autrey Hughes Aircraft Company P.O. Box 3310 Fullerton, Calif. 92634	1
Dr. Thomas W. Ellis Texas Instruments, Inc. 13500 N. Central Expressway Dallas, Texas 75231	1
Mr. Carl Hartdegen Palisades Sofar Station Bermuda Division of Palisades Geophysical Institute FPO New York 09560	1
Mr. Beaumont Buck Polar Research Laboratory 123 Santa Barbara Avenue Santa Barbara, Calif. 93101	1
Dr. M. Weinstein Underwater Systems, Inc. 8121 Georgia Avenue Silver Spring, Maryland 20910	1
Dr. Thomas G. Kincaid General Electric Company P.O. Box 1088 Schenectady, New York 12301	1
Dr. C.N.K. Mooers University of Delaware Newark, Delaware 19711	1
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute Woods Hole, Massachusetts 02543 Attn: Dr. Paul McElroy Dr. R. Spindel	2

UNCLASSIFIED DISTRIBUTION LIST

Dr. Richard James c/o Fleet Weather Facility 4301 Suitland Road Washington, D.C. 20390	1
Atlantic Oceanographic and Meteorological Laboratories 15 Rickenbacker Causeway Miami, Fla. 33149 Attn: Dr. John Proni	1
Research Triangle Institute Research Triangle Park Durham, North Carolina 27709 Attn: Dr. E.G. Baxa, Jr.	1
Science Applications, Inc. 8400 Westpark Drive McLean, Virginia 22102 Attn: Ms. Angela D'Amico Ms. Lorna Blumen	2
Bell Telephone Laboratories 1 Whippany Road Whippany, New Jersey 07981 Attn: Dr. Bruce Bogart Dr. Peter Hirsch	2
General Electric Company Heavy Military Electronic Systems Syracuse, New York 13201 Attn: Mr. Don Winfield	1
Javcor Incorporated 205 S. Whiting Street Suite 607 Alexandria, Virginia 22304 Attn: Dr. S. Adams	1

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

14 IAR REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
79802		
6. TITLE (and Subtitle)		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
Effects of Ocean Fronts on Multipath Vertical Angles and the Associated Biases in Array Bearing Estimation		
7. AUTHOR(s)		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
10. R.P. Flanagan and X. Zabalgogeoazcoa		
8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)		
N00014-74-C-0229		
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
Institute for Acoustical Research 615 S.W. 2nd Avenue Miami, Fla. 33130		
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS		12. REPORT DATE
Procuring Contracting Officer Office of Naval Research, Dept. of the Navy, Arlington, Va. 22217		11. July 1979
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES
		45
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
Office of Naval Research Resident Rep. Columbia University Lamont Doherty Geological Observatory Torrey Cliff, Palisades, New York 10913		Unclassified
		12a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)		
Distribution of this Document is unlimited		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)		
ocean fronts propagation bearing estimation ray model		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)		
An oceanic frontal system perpendicular to the propagation path is modeled with a deep receiver in warm water and a shallow source which is moved through the frontal system into progressively colder water. A ray model is used to calculate the arrival structure and determine the effects of the frontal system on ray amplitude and vertical angle. The receiving horizontal line array determines the bias in bearing estimation resulting from		

12 55

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 68 IS OBSOLETE
S/N 0102-014-8601

408-142

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

→ the changing multipath structure. This bias is found to be heavily dependent on array orientation and range into the frontal system while being only slightly dependent on array beamwidth. The underlying physics causing the multipath variations is the frontal system acting as a focusing lens. When the transducer positions are reversed, that is a deep receiver in cold water and a shallow source in progressively warmer water, the frontal system acts as a diverging lens. ↗

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)