TG 1168 JUNE 1971 Copy<sup>'</sup> No. 3



# AD 749669

# Technical Memorandum TROPOSPHERIC RANGE ERROR AT THE ZENITH

**HELEN S. HOPFIELD** 

Reproduced by NATIONAL TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICE U S Department of Commerce Springfield VA 22151



### THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY . APPLIED PHYSICS LABORATORY

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

	U	Ν	С	LA	SSI	FI	ED
--	---	---	---	----	-----	----	----

Security Classification			
DOCUMENT CONTR	OL DATA - R	& D	
Sequility classification of title, body of abstract and indexing a	nnotation must be	entered when the a	overall report is classified)
1 OHIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author)	aioa Ioh	20. HEPORT SE	CURITY CLASSIFICATION
The Johns Hopkins University Applied Phy-	sics Lab.	Unc	lassified
8621 Georgia Avenue		2h. GROUP	NIA
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910			
I REPORT TITLE			
Tropospheric Range Error at the Zenith			
4 DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates)			
Technical Report			
5 AUTHOR(5) (First name, middle initial, last nume)			
Helen S. Hopfield			
6 REPORT DATE	74. TO AL NO U	PAGES	7b. NO OF HEFS
June 1971	37		11
	94. JRIGINATOR	S REPORT NUME	)ER(5)
N00017-62-C-0604			
b. PROJECT NO	TO	1168	
c. ;	9b. OTHER REPO this report)	RT NO(S) (Any of	her numbers that may be assigned
1			
<i>d</i> ,			
10 DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT			
Approved for public release: distribution u	nlimited		
reproved for public release, distribution of	manner and a second		
11 SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	12. SPONSORING	MILITARY ACTI	VIT Y
· · · ·			
	National	Aeronauti	cs and Space Admin.
13 ABSTRACT			

The atmospheric range error in an electromagnetic signal arriving vertically at the earth is measured by the height integral of the refractivity N through the atmosphere (N =  $10^6$  (n-1) where n is the index of refraction). N in the nonionized atmosphere is the sum of "dry" and "wet" components, which are considered separately. Only the dry part is important at optical wavelengths and the present discussion deals principally with this dry part. Data from several thousand meteorological balloons were studied to develop a method for predicting the height integrals of  $N_{drv}$ . It is found theoretically and from observed data that, although  $N_{drv}$  depends on both temperature and pressure, its height integral is a linear function of surface pressure only. The slope is nearly the same, worldwide; there is, however, a very small but detectable latitude variation, corresponding to the latitude variation of g. It is shown that the vertical range error (dry component) at a given latitude can be predicted within 2 rms from surface pressure alone. Irregularities in the temperature profile do not affect the prediction. In view of these results, the equivalent height for a quartic N<sub>dry</sub> model must vary as surface temperature; it is approximately 40 km at 0°C and becomes zero near 0°K at all locations. Possible small differences between parameters for different stations are being examined.

DD FORM .. 1473

UNCLASSIF	TED
-----------	-----

Security Classification

14.

KEY WORDS

11

۰.

Electromagnetic signal refractivity Meteorological balloon information Temperature profiles Tropospheric range error

T

ĵ.

TG 1168 JUNE 1971

I

Technical Memorandum

# **TROPOSPHERIC RANGE ERROR AT THE ZENITH**

**HELEN S. HOPFIELD** 

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY 

APPLIED PHYSICS LABORATORY
8621 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

Operating under Contract N00017-62-C-0604 with the Department of the Navy

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

sija

### ABSTRACT

The atmospheric range error in an electromagnetic signal arriving vertically at the earth is measured by the height integral of the refractivity N through the atmosphere.  $(N \equiv 10^6 (n-1))$  where n is the index of refraction.) N in the non-ionized atmosphere is the sum of "dry" and "wet" components, which are considered separately. Only the dry part is important at optical wavelengths, and the present discussion deals principally with this dry part. Data from several thousand meteorological balloons were studied to develop a method for predicting the height integrals of N<sub>dry</sub>. It is found theoretically and from observed data that, although Ndry depends on both temperature and pressure, its height integral is a linear function of surface pressure only. The slope is nearly the same, worldwide; there is, however, a very small but detectable latitude variation, corresponding to the latitude variation of g. It is shown that the vertical range error (dry component) at a given latitude can be predicted within 2 mm rms from surface pressure alone. Irregularities in the temperature profile do not affect the prediction in the zenith direction. In view of these results, the equivalent height for a quartic N<sub>dry</sub> model must vary as surface temperature; it is approximately 40 km at 0°C and becomes zero near 0°K at all locations. Possible small differences between parameters for different stations are being examined

- iii - f

ŀ

ł

des .

No. Charles and the second statements

### CONTENTS

	List of Illustrations	•	•	•	•	vii
1.	Introduction .	•	•	•	•	1
2.	Theory .			•	•	3
	Zenith Integral of N Height Profile of N			•	•	3 5
3.	Data and Computatio	ons	•	•	•	13
4.	Results .	•	•	•	•	17
	$\int_{M} N_{d}$ dh versus Surfa Height Parameters Zenith Integral of N	ace Pre for the w	essure Quartic	N <sub>d</sub> Moo	lel	17 22 25
	References	•	•	•	•	29
	Acknowledgment	•		•	•	31

Preceding page blank

- v -

### ILLUSTRATIONS

1	Degree of Theoretical N <sub>d</sub> Profile	8
2	Profile of Tropospheric Refractivity N, Weather Ship E, 35°N, 48°W, July 1967	9
3	Vertical Integral of Refractivity during a Year, Balloon Data, Washington, D. C., U.S.A., 1967	14
4	Vertical Integral of Refractivity during a Year, Balloon Data, Albuquerque, New Mexico, U.S.A., 1967	15
5	Vertical Integral of Dry Component of Refractivity versus Surface Pressure .	19
6	Zenith Range Error per Millibar of Surface Pressure, Dry Component of Troposphere.	21
7	Observed and Predicted Vertical Integral of Refractivity at Washington, D. C., January and July 1967, Dry Component	26
8	Observed and Predicted Vertical Integral of Refractivity at Albuquerque, New Mexico, January and July 1967, Dry Component	27

## Preceding page blank

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The electromagnetically measured range from the earth to an object outside the atmosphere, e.g., the moon or an artificial satellite, is too large by more than 2 meters if the object is directly overhead, and by about twice that amount if the zenith angle of the line of sight is  $60^{\circ}$ . The precise amount of the atmospheric effect on range is given by the integral of (n-1) along the signal path, where n is the index of refraction. For convenience, the refractivity N is defined as  $10^{\circ}$  (n-1). Since N depends on atmospheric conditions, it varies along the signal path.

In the optical region, N for air is also a function of wavelength, and range measurements at two optical wavelengths could be used to remove refraction effects from the data. The instrumentation requirements for this are, however, very severe. In the radio region, the refractivity of the uncharged atmosphere (troposphere and stratosphere) is independent of signal frequency up to 15 000 MHz.

A theoretical refraction correction, if adequate, would be simpler than multifrequency measurements. A model to provide this correction was developed for radio use (initially for use with satellite doppler data), and the so-called "dry" part of it can also be applied in the optical region with little change.

- 1 -

### 2. THEORY

In order to predict the atmospheric range error in an electromagnetic signal at any elevation angle, it is necessary to know the range error for a signal in the zenith direction, i.e., the height integral  $10^{-6}$  fNdh in the existing state of the atmosphere. The error at a small zenith angle can be obtained directly from this, being little affected by the height profile of N. For very large zenith angles, however, it is necessary to know the N profile also.

### ZENITH INTEGRAL OF N

The refractivity of air at radio frequencies up to 15 000 MHz can be expressed as the sum of two components, "dry" and "wet," which will be designated by the subscripts d and w, respectively. Their values at a given point of the atmosphere can be computed from meteorological data. The equations given by Smith and Weintraub (Ref. 1) are:

$$N_{d} = \frac{77.6 P}{T}$$

$$N_{w} = \frac{3.73 \times 10^{5} e}{T^{2}},$$
(1)

in which T is the temperature in degrees Kelvin, P is the total pressure in millibars, and e is the partial pressure of water vapor, also in millibars.

At optical frequencies, the effect of water vapor is so much decreased as to be practically negligible. The above expression for  $N_d$ , however, is in close agreement with values of N given by the Edlén expression (Ref. 2) for the phase refractivity of dry air in the infrared (wavelengths of a few microns). The following discussion of the height integral of  $N_d$  therefore pertains either to the dry component of radio range error or to the entire optical range error in

Preceding page blank - 3 -

> the near infrared; but in the optical case, a dispersion correction of a few percent will be needed for laser wavelengths in the visible (Ref. 3).

The height integral of  $N_d$  in Eq. (1) can be deduced from the gas laws without knowledge of the shape of the  $N_d$ profile. If V is the volume and R is the gas constant for unit mass of dry air, if we assume that air is a perfect gas, we have, from the gas laws,

$$PV = RT$$

$$\frac{P}{T} = \frac{R}{V} = R\rho , \qquad (2)$$

where  $\rho$  is the density. The combination of Eqs. (1) and (2) yields:

$$N_d = 10^{-3} \times 77.6 \text{ Rp},$$

if R and  $\rho$  are in cgs units. Then

$$\int N_{\rm d} \, dh = 10^{-3} \, x \, 77.6 \, \text{R} \int \rho \, dh \, . \tag{3}$$

The pressure at the surface is:

$$P_{s} = \int \rho g \, dh \, . \tag{4}$$

If g, the acceleration of gravity, is assumed constant over the height range of the lower atmosphere, the combination of Eqs. (3) and (4) yields an atmospheric height contribution of:

$$\Delta h = \int (n-1)dh = 10^{-9} \times \frac{77.6 \text{ R P}_{s}}{g},$$
 (5)

- 4 -

1

if all quantities are in cgs units. Thus theoretically, in a dry atmosphere, the zenith range error produced by refraction is directly proportional to the surface pressure and is independent of the way in which temperature varies with height (Refs. 4 and 5). Observed data to test this conclusion for the real atmosphere will be presented below.

The above theory does not apply to the wet component, which will be discussed briefly later.

### HEIGHT PROFILE OF N

Although the N profile is not needed to predict the atmospheric effect at or near the zenith, this is not true at low elevation angles. To be theoretically valid, a profile model must account for a zenith integral of N which is consistent with Eq. (5). In developing a model it is assumed that each component of N (dry or wet) is a function of its surface value and of height above the earth, but not of horizontal position or time during a short series of observations. Thus diurnal variations and weather fronts are neglected for the time being. The dry and wet components are different functions of height.

In a dry atmosphere, at heights small enough so that the acceleration of gravity g can be considered constant, the pressure (Ref. 6) is given by:

$$P = P_{g} e^{-\frac{g}{R} \int_{0}^{n} \frac{dh}{T}}, \qquad (6)$$

where  $P_s$  is the pressure at the surface of the earth, R is the gas constant, and h is height above the surface.

If the temperature T does not vary with height in the atmosphere, this becomes:

$$-\frac{gh}{RT}$$

$$P = P_{s} e \qquad (7)$$

- 5 -

Combining Eq. (7) with Eq. (1) yields an exponential N profile for a dry isothermal atmosphere:

$$-\frac{gh}{RT}$$

$$N = N_{s} e \qquad (8)$$

Exponential models for the total N and for its separate components have been extensively used (Refs. 7, 8, and 9).

In the earth's atmosphere, however, the temperature on the average decreases with height at a fairly constant lapse rate in the troposphere, is moderately constant in the tropopause region, and above that increases slowly with height in the stratosphere. Considering the troposphere first, let us assume that the lapse rate  $\alpha$  is constant

$$\left( \boldsymbol{\alpha} \equiv -\frac{\mathrm{dT}}{\mathrm{dh}} \right)$$
. Then

$$T = T_{s} - \alpha h.$$
 (9)

Substituting Eq. (9) into Eq. (6) and integrating, we get (Ref. 6):

$$P = P_{s}\left(\frac{T_{s} - \alpha h}{T_{s}}\right) .$$
 (10)

Thus, the pressure when  $\alpha \neq 0$  is not an exponential function of height. If P and T from Eqs. (9) and (10) are used in Eq. (1), the N<sub>d</sub> profile can be put in the form (Ref. 4):

$$N_{d} = N_{d} \left[ \frac{\frac{T_{s}}{\alpha} - h}{\frac{T_{s}}{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha}}} \right] , \qquad (11)$$

- 6 -

where

$$\mu = \frac{g}{R\alpha} - 1.$$
 (12)

The degree of the  $N_d$  profile is shown in Fig. 1 as a function of the temperature lapse rate  $\alpha$ . For any positive value of  $\alpha$  (negative  $\frac{dT}{dh}$ ) which is likely to occur in the troposphere,  $\mu$  is positive.

The degree  $\mu$  would be zero for a temperature lapse rate of 34°C/km, an improbably high value. The adiabatic lapse rate is 9.8°C/km (Ref. 6), but observed tropospheric lapse rates are generally less (~ 7°C/km in warm climates, less near the poles).  $\alpha$  and  $\mu$  are negative in the region of a temperature inversion, and negative in the stratosphere above the tropopause.

It was shown earlier (Ref. 5) that the zenith integral of  $N_d$  in an atmosphere with constant lapse rate (zero, positive or negative), as obtained by integrating Eq. (8) or Eq. (11) with appropriate limits, is identical to the value of Eq. (5). If the lapse rate is constant and known, it is therefore possible to write an equation for the  $N_d$  profile which will match an observed profile as regards both the zenith integral and the profile shape. Since in practice the lapse rate is only fairly constant in the troposphere and changes sign at the tropopause, any single mathematical function will not match the actual  $N_d$  profile shape perfectly at all heights. A single function can, however, yield the correct zenith integral, regardless of irregularities in the profile shape; and <u>also</u> provide a usable approximation to the profile shape in the denser part of the atmosphere.

A fourth-degree model ( $\mu$  = 4 in Eqs. (11) and (12)), which was developed earlier (Ref. 4), corresponds, if g = 980 cm/s<sup>2</sup>, to a temperature lapse rate of 6.828°C/km, and does on the average match observed profiles well to a considerable height, in regions of the earth where this lapse rate is a realistic value in the troposphere (Fig. 2).

- 7 -



- 8 -

1

Ĩ

1

Ţ

The

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

I

7





1

1

- 9 -

Ŧ

The quartic model provides an integrable expression for the range correction  $\int N d\rho$  along the slant range vector  $\rho$  at any elevation angle, and this can be used as a range correction at elevation angles for which the bending of the signal path is negligible. An algorithm for simplifying the computation of the correction has been developed by Yionoulis (Ref. 10).

Height parameters for the quartic model have been obtained from observed data that will be described below. Let us write the quartic profile expression in the form:

$$N_{d} = \frac{N_{d}}{h_{d}^{4}} (h_{d} - h)^{4} , \qquad (13)$$

where the height  $h_d$  replaces  $T_s/\alpha$  of Eq. (11). For  $T_s = 273.16^{\circ}K$  (0°C) and  $\alpha = 6.828^{\circ}/km$ ,  $T_s/\alpha = 40.006$  km; but  $h_d$  is now to be determined empirically. Heights are to be measured above the surface. The zenith range effect is now:

$$\Delta h = 10^{-6} \int N_d dh = 10^{-6} \cdot \frac{N_d \frac{h_d}{s}}{5},$$
 (14)

in which  $h_d$  and the height error  $\Delta h$  are in the same units. In view of Eq. (1), this can be compatible with Eq. (5) only if  $h_d$  is proportional to  $T_K$ . This hypothesis was tested by examining balloon meteorological data, as will be described in the next section.

Height parameters for the wet component  $N_W$  for the radio case were also obtained from the data. The theoretical considerations given above do not apply to the wet term, but for convenience, it has been assumed that a quartic profile can be used for  $N_W$  also. The work on the wet component will be mentioned only briefly; it is less far advanced, and also is not of interest for laser applications. Except at very low angles, the dry component accounts for at least 90% of the range effect even at radio frequencies.

- 10 -

F

I

T

1

-----

1

The wet component, however, is responsible for most of the variability of the radio range effect and is much less predictable than the dry part. Much more work is needed on the wet component.

### 3. DATA AND COMPUTATIONS

Meteorological balloon data in 14 one-year sets, from ten different geographical locations, have been studied. There were two balloons per day in each case: so far, a total of approximately 10 000 balloons. For each balloon flight, data were obtained at the standard pressure levels and also at additional "significant levels," i.e., generally 50 or 60 observed points per balloon ascent. The data at each point included height, pressure, temperature, and relative humidity, thus providing the necessary information for computing the dry and wet components of N from Eq. (1) (for radio frequencies). Each balloon yielded one observed profile of N. The data were on magnetic tape and the computations were done with an IBM 360/91 computer.

The zenith integrals of  $N_d$  and  $N_w$  were obtained from these N profiles by numerical integration. Occasional flights in which any sort of equipment failure occurred were deleted from the data collection. The data used included only flights which gave complete dry data to at least the 30-mb level (~ 24 km) and complete wet data to at least the 500-mb level (5.5 to 6 km). In computing the numerical integrals, a small correction was added at the top so as to approximate the true total integral. For the dry component, this correction was based on the topmost observed pressure and Eq. (5) (a slight improvement over the correction used in Ref. 5).

Two one-year sets of the zenith integrals obtained from these balloon data are shown in Figs. 3 and 4: one for Washington, D. C. (85 meters above sea level), and one for Albuquerque, New Mexico (1620 meters above sea level). The three sections of these figures show, respectively, the total integral and the separate integrals of the wet and the dry components, as functions of time during the year. Each point represents data from a single balloon flight.

It is noticeable that the dry component integral shows little seasonal variation, although some weather effects can

Preceding page blank

2.65 TOTAL 2 2.55 2.45 2.35 INTEGRAL (meters) 0.30 0.20 WET COMPONENT 0.10 0.00 2.40 DRY COMPONENT 2.30 2.20 1 JAN 1 APR 1 JUL 1 OCT **31 DEC** DAY

.

11

4

4

1

÷.

1)

-

1

1

1

I

1

чž

- 1



THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY APPLIED PHYSICS LABORATORY SILVER SPRING MARYLAND

- 14 -





be seen. The wet component shows large seasonal and also weather effects.

1.1

11

1

.)

I

The wet integral  $\int N_W dh$  is less than  $\int N_d dh$  by an order of magnitude or more, yet produces most of the variation in the total integral, at radio frequencies. At laser wavelengths, the wet contribution is so much reduced as to be practically negligible.

The average value of  $\int N_d dh$  through the atmosphere, for the year, was approximately 2.3 meters at Washington, while that at Albuquerque was 40 cm less, or 1.9 meters, because of the different heights of the two stations above sea level. The average radio value of  $\int N_W dh$  for the year at Albuquerque was approximately  $60^{\circ}$  of that at Washington.

### 4. RESULTS

 $\int N_d$  dh VERSUS SURFACE PRESSURE

Figure 5 shows samples of the height integral of  $N_d$  as a function of surface pressure for several samples of data from different locations. Equation (5) predicts a linear relation. The plotted points are observed values of the integral from the balloon data. It was assumed (cf. Eq. (5)) that:

$$\int N_{d} dh = k P_{s} , \qquad (15)$$

and the slope k was obtained from each one-year set of observed data by a least squares procedure. The results are listed in Table 1, and the lines given by Eq. (15) with these empirical slopes k are shown respectively for the samples of Fig. 5. For each one-year data set, the rms error in predicting  $\int N_d$  dh from the empirical value of k was between 1 and 2 mm. The theoretical line of Eq. (5) was also obtained for each case, using for each a mean value of g at mid-atmosphere (6 km high, approximately the 500 mb level), at the latitude of the station (Ref. 11). The theoretical and empirical lines are so nearly coincident that they cannot be shown as separate on the scale of the figure.

The delaying effect of the dry atmosphere (troposphere and stratosphere) on a ranging signal in the zenith direction can therefore be predicted with an rms deviation of the order of 2 mm of range (one-way travel of the signal).

The empirical slopes for the different locations are nearly but not quite the same. The theoretical slope (Eq. (5)) is a function of the local value of g, hence it varies slightly with latitude. Figure 6 shows this variation. The curve represents the theoretical slope as a function of latitude, using for g its value at the local latitude at a height of 6 km above sea level. The separate points on the Table 1 Observed Slope k for relation  $\int_{N_d} dh = k P_g$  Prediction f<sub>Nd</sub> dh Ø(meters) error in 0.00178 0.00152 0.00088 0.00190 0.00189 0.00146 0.00159 0.00160 0.00161 0.00200 0.00150 0.00150 0.00174 0.00171 0.002279048 0.002277716 0.002282242 0.002278113 0.002276762 0.002277612 0.002276946 0.002277840 0.002277228 0.002280026 0.002276673 0.002280070 0.002280307 0.002280862 (m/mb) × (meters) ¶N<sub>d</sub> dh 2. 32085 2.32390 2.25882 2.29636 2.22478 1.90810 2.31787 2.29241 2.25030 2.30960 2.31013 2.31234 2.30569 2.28651 Mean, Year 1963 1965 1967 1967 1967 1967 1967 1967 1967 1963 1965 1967 1967 1967 (meters) Height 10 10 79 85 318 239 1620 100 S ŝ 10 191 ŋ ŝ W175.901 120°34'W 66°39'E 66°39'E 166°39'E 170°43'W 92°22'W W. 10-89 77°28'W 94°11'W 14°24'W Longitude 18°W 48°W 48°W 46°52'N 38°59'N 45°35'N 38°58'N 35°03'N 34°44'N N.L1.61 N171º01 N171-91 14°20'S 7.55'S Latitude 35°N 35°N 35°N Vaudenberg Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico Pago Pago, Samoa Washington, D.C. Ascension Island St. Cloud, Minn. (Dulles Airport) Caribou, Maine Weather Ship E Weather Ship E Weather Ship E Columbia, Mo. California Wake Island Wake Island Wake Island Station

- 18 -

THE JOHNS HOPKING UNIVERSITY APPLIED PHYSICS LABORATORY SILVER BARING, MARYLAND

-

\_

- 1

]

- 1

./

.)

J

1

1

I

And the second second

Ι

-----

1

1







1

-1

1

.1

. 1

Ψ

5

. .

a i

J

Ĩ

Fig. 5 (Continued)





THE RESIDENCE AND ADDRESS A

÷

F

1

the state of the take

No.

same graph are the empirical slopes k obtained for the various data sets; these also show a latitude variation and their trend is in good agreement with the theoretical variation. The empirical slope k for Albuquerque (1620 meters high) is not markedly different from the empirical slopes for the stations near sea level.

It is not certain that no biases are present, but it appears that they must be small. The data heights used in the numerical integration are geopotential heights derived from the gas laws, but these differ very little from geometric heights, especially at middle latitudes. The use of a mean (mid-atmosphere) value of g to get the theoretical slope of the line of Eq. (5) is, of course, an approximation. Water vapor content was neglected as regards the value of the gas constant per gram of air, but this effect is very small. The value used was  $R = 2.8704 \times 10^6 \text{ erg g}^{-1} \text{cK}^{-1}$  (Ref. 11).

The height integrals  $\int N_d$  dh have been referred to as "zenith integrals," but this is something of a misnomer. Balloons are blown by the wind and do not actually rise vertically. The height specified is the height co-ordinate of the balloon position, its lateral displacement being unknown. The fact that the integral of  $N_d$  with the height component of the oblique rise of the balloon is so closely related to pressure at the launch site would seem to argue that the horizontal gradients involved are not very large.

### HEIGHT PARAMETERS FOR THE QUARTIC N<sub>d</sub> MODEL

The prediction of only the height integral of N may not provide enough information for a range correction at larger zenith angles, where the temperature profile does have a significant effect. For this, a model of the N profile may also be needed.

Since  $N_d$  is proportional to P/T, but its height integral is proportional to surface pressure alone, it follows from Eq. (14) that the equivalent height  $h_d$  for the quartic  $N_d$  profile must be proportional to surface temperature. To

examine this theory, it was assumed that:

$$\mathbf{h}_{d} = \mathbf{h}_{d} + \mathbf{a}_{d}^{T} \mathbf{s} \mathbf{C} , \qquad (16)$$

where  $h_d$  is the "equivalent height" of the quartic  $N_d$ profile which will match the theoretical height integral of  $N_d$  to the observed one;  $h_{d_0}$  is the value of  $h_d$  when the surface temperature is 0°C,  $T_{sC}$  is the observed surface temperature in °C, and a is the temperature coefficient of the height increase. The parameters  $h_{d_0}$  and  $a_d$  were obtained from the data by a least-squares procedure.

To do this, Eq. (16) was combined with Eq. (14) to get a theoretical expression for N<sub>d</sub> dh corresponding to the surface  $N_d$  at the time of a balloon flight; these theoretical integrals based on the observed values of N<sub>s</sub> were then equated to the observed integrals from balloon data. then equated to the observed for the heights  $h_d$  as The results are listed in Table 2. The heights  $h_d$  as were found to be closely the same for all stations regardless of the station height above sea level, and are in close agreement with the value predicted by theory  $(T_g/\alpha, \text{ quoted above})$ . These heights should be interpreted as parameters for matching observed integrals, not as indicating any undulation of actual pressure levels above surface undulations. The results may contain information not as yet deciphered, The about latitude, longitude, and surface height effects. balloons at all stations were launched at 0 and 12 hours U.T., hence at different values of local time.

Extrapolating from the empirical values of Table 2, the equivalent height of the model atmosphere would in each case fall to zero within a few degrees of 0°K. The deviations from absolute zero may be related to second-order effects (e.g., gravity anomalies, atmospheric tides, etc.). These have not yet been investigated.

		, P	a	JN <sub>d</sub> dh,	Prediction Error in
Station	Year	o Above Station (km)	ر (km/°C)	Observed Mean (meters)	JN <sub>d</sub> dh σ(meters)
Weather Ship E	1963	39.998	0.15111	2. 32085	0.00141
Weather Ship E	1965	40.035	0.14910	2.31787	0.00144
Weather Ship E	1967	40.008	0.14976	2.32390	0.00170
Ascension Island	1967	40.099	0.14982	2.29241	0.00083
Caribou, Maine	1967	40.066	0.14830	2.25882	0.00155
Washigton, D. C. (Dulles Airport)	1967	40.066	0.14893	2.29636	0.00159
St. Cloud, Minn.	1967	40.069	0.14777	2.22478	0.00128
Columbia, Mo.	1967	40.069	0.14852	2.25030	0.00189
Albuquerque, New Mexico	1967	40.057	0.14764	1.90810	0.00138
Vandenberg Air Force Base, California	1967	40.054	0. 14750	2.28651	0.00147
Wake Island	1963	39, 999	0.15063	2.30960	0.00156
Wake Island	1965	40.024	0.15087.	2.31234	0.00154
Wake Island	1967	39.999	0, 15179	2.31013	0.00187

ł

1

0.001675

2.30569

0.14409

40.222

1967

Pago Pago, Samoa

• 1

١

1

1

 $\left| \cdot \right\rangle$ 

-1 2

Ŀ.

a i

-

- All

-

......

.

1

ł

1

!\_\_

1

ł

Height Parameters for the Quartic  $N_d$  Model (cf. Eq. 16)

Table 2

- 24 -

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY APPLIED PHYSICS LABORATORY SILVER SPRING, MARVLAND The integral of  $N_d$  through the atmosphere can be predicted at the zenith or in a different direction by using the parameters of Table 2 and the expressions developed in Refs. 4, 5, and 10. Figures 7 and 8 show samples of predicting the zenith range error (dry part) from the quartic profile and the parameters of Table 2. The rms values of the deviations are less than 2 mm in all cases.

When large zenith angles are to be used, study of the temperature profile and its time variations at a given location can be of use for developing an N<sub>d</sub> profile model to fit the location. The height parameters for a theoretical model based on any desired constant lapse rate are easily deduced from the results of Table 2 and Eqs. (11) and (12). To match a given observed integral, the equivalent height h<sub>d</sub> of the theoretical integral varies  $(\mu + 1)^{-1}$ , hence the equivalent height at 0°C' for a theoretical h<sub>d</sub> profile of degree 5 (to fit a lapse rate of 4.8°C/km, cf. Fig. 1) would be (6/5). A0 or 48 km. The temperature coefficient of h<sub>d</sub> must then change by the same factor. Ray tracing studies may also be needed, to compare path curvature effects for different temperature profiles.

The larger the zenith angle, the more important are the effects of horizontal gradients in the atmosphere. So far, these have been neglected.

### ZENITH INTEGRAL OF N

The integral of  $N_W$  (radio value) will be mentioned only briefly. For convenience, the  $N_W$  profile can be represented by an expression of the same degree as the  $N_d$  profile, but it does not have the same theoretical basis. The equivalent height  $h_W$  is much less than  $h_d$ , and so far, the integral of  $N_W$  is predicted from surface data with an order of magnitude less precision than the dry integral, i.e., to a few centimeters instead of millimeters. Preliminary work on  $N_W$  was reported earlier (Ref. 4), and work is continuing on this aspect of the problem. It is important for radio applications, though not for lasers.

- 25 -



4.

÷. 1

11

44

Y

I

Fig. 7 OBSERVED AND PREDICTED VERTICAL INTEGRAL OF REFRACTIVITY AT WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY AND JULY 1967, DRY COMPONENT

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY APPLIED PHYSICS LABORATORY SILVER SPRING MARYLAND

ı

I

I

-----

a survey a

I Share

a service a

į.,

B ton B





-

### REFERENCES

- E. K. Smith, Jr. and S. Weintraub, "The Constants in the Equation for Atmospheric Refractive Index at Radio Frequencies," <u>Proc. IRE</u>, Vol. 41, No. 8, August 1953, p. 1035.
- 2. B. Edlén, "The Dispersion of Standard Air," <u>J. Opt.</u> <u>Soc. Am.</u>, Vol. 43, No. 5, May 1953, p. 339.
- E. Wood and M. C. Thompson, Jr., "The Group Refractive Index of Air," <u>Appl. Optics</u>, Vol. 7, No. 7, July 1968, p. 1408.
- H. S. Hopfield, "Two-Quartic Tropospheric Refractivity Profile for Correcting Satellite Data," <u>J. Geophys. Res.</u>, Vol. 74, No. 18, 20 August 1969, p. 4487.
- H. S. Hopfield, "Tropospheric Effect on Electromagnetically Measured Range: Prediction from Surface Weather Data," <u>Radio Science</u>, Vol. 6, No. 3, March 1971, p. 357.
- 6. B. Haurwitz, <u>Dynamic Meteorology</u>, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1941.
- B. R. Bean and E. J. Dutton, <u>CRPL Exponential</u> <u>Reference Atmosphere</u>, U. S. National Bureau of Standards Monograph No. 4, 1959.
- 8. B. R. Bean, "Concerning the Bi-exponential Nature of the Tropospheric Radio Refractive Index," <u>Beitr.</u> <u>Phys. Atmos.</u>, Vol. 34, 1961, p. 81.
- B. R. Bean and E. J. Dutton, <u>Radio Meteorology</u>, U. S. National Bureau of Standards Monograph 92, 1966.

Preceding page blank

- S. M. Yionoulis, "Algorithm to Compute Tropospheric Refraction Effects on Range Measurements," <u>J. Geophys. Res.</u>, Vol. 75, No. 36, 20 December 1970, p. 7636.
- 11. <u>Smithsonian Meteorological Tables</u>, prepared by R. J. List, 6th Rev. Ed., 1963.

5

. 1

. .

. 1

. 1

. 1

. 1

I

1

### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The contribution of H. K. Utterback of APL, who prepared the computing programs and handled the computations, is acknowledged with appreciation. The meteorological balloon data for the study were obtained from the U. S. National Climatic Center (formerly Weather Records Center), and I wish to thank its members for their cooperation.