


AD-A154 060


USE OF THE TACOM (TANK-AUTOMOTIVE COMMAND) THERMAL
IMAGING MODEL(U) ARMY TANK-AUTOMOTIVE COMMAND WARREN MI 1/1
J M GRAZIANO ET AL. FEB 85 TACOM-13002

UNCLASSIFIED

F/G 17/5

NL





4

AD-A154 060

R and CENTER
LABORATORY
TECHNICAL REPORT

NO. 13082

USE OF THE
TACOM THERMAL IMAGING MODEL
FEBRUARY 1985



DTIC
ELECTE
S MAY 23 1985 **D**

B

[Handwritten signature]

JAMES M. GRAZIANO
GRANT R. GERHART
US Army Tk-Autmv Command
ATTN: AMSTA-ZSA
Warren, MI 48397-5000

by

Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

U.S. ARMY TANK-AUTOMOTIVE COMMAND
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER
Warren, Michigan 48090

DTIC FILE COPY

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED			1b RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS NONE		
2a SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3 DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for Public Release: Distribution Unlimited		
2b DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE					
4 PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) 13082			5 MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)		
6a NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION US Army Tank-Automotive Command		6b OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) AMSTA-ZSA		7a NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION	
6c ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Warren, MI 48397-5000		7b ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)			
8a NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION Survivability Research Division		8b OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) AMSTA-ZS		9 PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER	
8c ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) US Army TACOM TACL, Bldg 200C Warren, MI 48397-5000		10 SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS			
		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO		PROJECT NO	TASK NO
				WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO	
11 TITLE (Include Security Classification) "Use of the TACOM Thermal Imaging Model"					
12 PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) James M. Graziano, Grant R. Gerhart					
13a TYPE OF REPORT Progress		13b TIME COVERED FROM Oct 84 TO Feb 85		14 DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 85 Feb	
15 PAGE COUNT 21					
16 SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION					
17 COSATI CODES			18 SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) TTIM Image Simulation FLIR modeling Thermal Imaging System Modeling		
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP			
19 ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) This report outlines the basic function and architecture of the TACOM Thermal Imaging Model. Typical use of the simulation model are given as well as examples of output imagery generated from the model.					
20 DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT ☒ UNCLASSIFIED UNLIMITED ☐ SAME AS RPT ☐ CONF USERS			21 ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED		
22a NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL James M. Graziano			22b TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (313) 574-8634		22c OFFICE SYMBOL AMSTA-ZSA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
1.0. INTRODUCTION	7
2.0. TTIM ARCHITECTURE	7
3.0. TTIM APPLICATIONS	8
4.0. TTIM OUTPUT IMAGERY EXAMPLES	8
LIST OF REFERENCES	20
DISTRIBUTION LIST.	21

Application For
 Regular License ☒
 Renewal ☐
 Transfer ☐
 Special License ☐

Applicant's Name _____
 Address _____
 City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Employer's Name _____
 Address _____
 City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Signature _____
 Title _____

License Code _____
 Reason for License _____
 Date _____

A-1

3

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure	Title	Page
4-1.	Image Model Example with Varying Rain	10
4-2.	Ideal Atmosphere - Varying Target Range - Sensor: SENSOR A.	11
4-3.	Advection Fog - Target Range: 1Km - Sensor: SENSOR A.	12
4-4.	Sensor Comparison - Ideal Atmosphere.	13
4-5.	Sensor Comparison - Advection Fog - 5Km Visibility.	14
4-6.	Ideal Sensor - Ideal Atmosphere	15
4-7.	Sensor: SENSOR A - Ideal Atmosphere/Rain.	16
4-8.	Sensor: SENSOR B - Ideal Atmosphere/Rain.	17
4-9.	Sensor: SENSOR C - Ideal Atmosphere/Rain.	18
4-10.	Sensor Vibration Simulation	19

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY.

1.0. INTRODUCTION

This report presents output imagery from TACOM's Thermal Imaging Model (TTIM) developed by Timothy J. Kogne, Brian K. Matise and Frederick G. Smith of Optimetrics, Inc. for the U.S. Army Tank-Automotive Command (TACOM) under Contract DAAE07-81-C-4053. TTIM is capable of processing measured or modeled infrared scenes so as to account for FLIR sensor effects, natural atmospheric effects, and battlefield environment effects. This allows the operator to relate surface temperatures on the vehicle to image grey levels and vice-versa. The importance of the image simulation procedure is that the concept vehicle designer for the first time will have simulated imagery of his vehicle concept as seen through some threat sensor configuration. The relative survivability criteria for various concept vehicle designs can then be evaluated in a systematic manner.

2.0 TTIM ARCHITECTURE

A brief overview of TTIM is presented here. For detailed information on the model refer to references 1 and 2. TTIM is a menu driven program implemented on a VAX 11/750 computer system interfaced to a Comtal image processing system. Attached to the program are data libraries which provide the appropriate data for various types of sensors, atmospheric conditions and obscuring battlefield effects such as smoke or aerosols. Many of the various sub-models which make up TTIM have been validated. Validation of the model as a whole will be completed shortly.

TTIM can be divided into three submodels: the natural atmospheric effects model, the battlefield effects model and the sensor model. The natural atmospheric effects model is a version of LOWTRAN6 developed by the U.S. Air Force Geophysics Laboratory. LOWTRAN6 calculates atmospheric transmittance and radiance over .25 to 28.5 μm [ref. 3]. The battlefield effects model is a version of ACTMAD developed by Optimetrics for the U.S. Army Atmospheric Sciences Laboratory (ASL). ACTMAD allows for multiple varieties of smoke munitions and smoke sources positioned in any configuration [ref.4]. ACTMAD calculates a spatial map of the obscurant cloud attenuation and path radiance. The sensor model basically consists of two parts: an optical system model and a sensor subsystem model. The sensor subsystem model utilizes the same transfer function forms as the NV&EOL Static Performance Model for Thermal Viewing Systems [ref. 5].

TTIM also has the ability to perform the inverse of the process described above. This allows the user to inverse process recorded field data to remove sensor and atmospheric effects and obtain an apparent temperature map of the scene. This unique capability can assist the vehicle designer in reducing the signature of a fielded vehicle.

3.0 TTIM APPLICATIONS

TTIM can aid in many areas of image processing and scene analysis. Immediate plans are to integrate TTIM into on-going vehicle perceptability research programs conducted at TACOM [ref. 6,7,8]. This work is concerned with improving vehicle survivability by identifying and reducing vehicle signature cue features which contribute to target detection. TTIM can provide the vehicle designer with an extremely attractive, cost effective tool for evaluating concept vehicle survivability. Applications for TTIM also include search process modeling studies of human observers to establish and confirm detection and recognition criteria. In addition, TTIM could assist in thermal sensor design and evaluation and also in evaluating smoke and weather obscurant effectiveness. TTIM can also assist in establishing sensor platform stabilization requirements.

4.0 TTIM OUTPUT IMAGERY EXAMPLES

The following pages contain examples of imagery generated via the use of TTIM. Each figure is labeled with target range, weather conditions, type of aerosol present and sensor type. Three different sensors are used in the examples. To avoid classification of this document the names of the sensors have been withheld and are referred to as SENSOR A, SENSOR B, AND SENSOR C. SENSOR A has a serial 1x14 scanning detector array and SENSOR B has a serial 2x14 scanning detector array. Both SENSOR A and SENSOR B have a f-number of 2.0 and a detector area of $4.50 \times 10^{-6} \text{ cm}^2$. SENSOR C has a parallel 180x1 scanning detector array, a f-number of 2.53 and a detector area of $2.58 \times 10^{-5} \text{ cm}^2$.

The tank scene in figure 1 illustrates the effect rain has on SENSOR C. Presently the model outputs the average effects rain has on a thermal scene. Modeled weather conditions are also assumed to be spatially symmetric. Phase II of the model will address both of these issues.

The model has zoomed on the tank in figures 2 thru 5 to show the resolution loss suffered when viewing distant targets. Later figures do not zoom on the data in this manner and therefore a distant tank appears smaller than a close tank through the same field of view lens. Figure 2 illustrates a best case scenario using SENSOR A when viewing a tank at the ranges shown. Note in this figure that at a 5 km target range even in a clear atmosphere the target is barely perceptible using this sensor. Figure 3 contains the same input image as for the 1 km case except the atmosphere has several different densities of fog.


Figures 4 and 5 illustrates a performance comparison for ideal and fog atmospheres between three sensors. The figures show that at 1 km target range in a clear or thin fog atmosphere there are only slight differences between each sensor's output. Close examination

shows that SENSOR B is slightly better than SENSOR A, most likely due to the square root of two improvement in the sensor's signal to noise ratio. Similar the output using SENSOR C is of better quality than that of SENSOR B's. The differences between each sensor's output is enhanced when viewing in less favorable conditions. At 3 km target range in figures 4 and 5 the tank is much more recognizable using SENSOR C and in the ideal atmosphere case it is possibly even identifiable.


Figures 6 thru 9 represent a case study using the same three sensors and an ideal sensor viewing a tank at one and three kilometers through a clear and rainy atmosphere. In this imagery the data is scaled properly so that the tank at 1 km appears three times as large as the tank at 3 km. The same performance trends observed in figures 4 and 5 between the three sensors can be seen in figures 6 thru 9. Note that although SENSOR C appears to be a very good sensor there is a significant difference between SENSOR C's imagery in figure 9 and the ideal sensor imagery in figure 6, particular at 3 km target range.

The performance of each sensor in the battlefield atmospheric effects module was also analyzed. The L8A1 and XM76 smokes grenades were set off at various distances and spacings between the sensor and the target. Final results and hard copies of these tests however were not available at the time of publication.

The model is also ideal for establishing sensor stabilization parameters. Figure 10 contains a tank at one kilometer when viewed with a sensor mounted on a non-stable platform. The imagery illustrates the degrading effect vibration at 0, 200, 400, and 600 u-radians rms can have on the sensor's performance. Even at 1 km target range as in figure 10, the vibration causes the vehicle's road wheels and smaller components to become indistinguishable. At longer target ranges, the degrading effect of sensor vibration will be increased and the vehicle's detected signature will tend to blend in more and more with the background.








SENSOR COMPARISON IDEAL ATMOSPHERE

RANGE = 1KM



RANGE = 3KM





FIGURE 4

SENSOR COMPARISON ADVECTION FOG 5KM VISIBILITY

RANGE = 1KM



RANGE = 3KM




FIGURE 5

IDEAL ATMOSPHERE




FIGURE 6

SENSOR A



FIGURE 7

SENSOR B

100% 100% 100% 100%



RAIN = 3.12 MM/HR




FIGURE 8

SENSOR C



FIGURE 9

SETHI IN POSITION SIMILARITY



PARAMETERS: IMAGE RESOLUTION = 250 X 210
 FIELD OF VIEW = 2 DEGREES
 SPOT SIZE = 0.15 M
 RANGE = 1000 M

FIGURE 10

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. B.K. Matise, T.J. Rogne, F.G. Smith, "TACOM Imaging Sensor Simulation Model for Vehicle Signature Vulnerability Evaluation", Proceedings of the 1984 KRC Signature Symposium, Vol. 1, August, 1984.
2. T.J. Rogne, B.K. Matise, F.G. Smith, "Development of the TACOM Thermal Imaging Model", Vol. I and II, TACOM final report, contract no. DAAE07-81-C-4093, February, 1985.
3. F.X. Kneizys, E.P. Shettle, W.O. Gallery, et al. "Atmospheric Transmittance/Radiance: Computer Code LOWTRAN6", AFGL-TR-83-0187, Air Force Geophysics Laboratory, August, 1983.
4. B.K. Matise, J.W. Petraska, T.J. Rogne, F.G. Smith, "Smoke Obscuration Effects Model", Optometrics report no. OMI-82-025, December, 1982.
5. J.A. Ratches, W.R. Lawson, L.P. Obert, et al., "Night Vision Laboratory Static Performance Model for Thermal Viewing Systems", U.S. Army NV&EOL, April, 1975.
6. J.M. Graziano, G.R. Gerhart, M. Alband, "The Use of Digital Image Enhancement to Improve Vehicle Perceptability", Proceedings of the 1982 KRC Signature Symposium, Vol. 1, August, 1982.
7. G.R. Gerhart, J.M. Graziano, M. . Carter, "Vehicle Perceptability Analysis", Proceedings of the 1983 KRC Signature Symposium, Vol. 1, August, 1983.
8. G.R. Gerhart, J.M. Graziano, D.J. Thomas, J.A. Dumas, "Thermal Cue Feature Analysis", Proceedings of the 1984 KRC Signature Symposium, Vol. 1, August, 1984.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

	Copies
Commander US Army Tank-Automotive Command ATTN: AMSTA-TSL (Technical Library) Warren, MI 48397-5000	2
Manager Defense Logistics Studies Information Exchange ATTN: DRXMC-D Fort Lee, VA 23801	2
Commander Defense Technical Information Center Bldg. 5, Cameron Station ATTN: DDAC Alexandria, VA 22314	12

END

FILMED

6-85

DTIC