

AD-A038 463

VIRGINIA UNIV CHARLOTTESVILLE DEPT OF ENGINEERING SC--ETC F/G 8/5
DEVELOPMENT OF FINITE ELEMENT MODELS FOR THE EARTH'S GRAVITY FI--ETC(U)
FEB 77 J L JUNKINS

DAA653-76-C-0067

UNCLASSIFIED

UVA/525023/ESS77/103

ETL-0096


NL

| OF |
AD
A038463



END

DATE
FILMED
5 - 77



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

FL

ETL-0096

3

RESEARCH LABORATORIES FOR THE ENGINEERING SCIENCES

SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING AND
APPLIED SCIENCE

See 1413
in back

University of Virginia

Charlottesville, Virginia 22901

DEVELOPMENT OF FINITE ELEMENT MODELS
FOR THE EARTH'S GRAVITY FIELD

PHASE I: MACRO GRAVITY MODEL FOR
SATELLITE ORBIT INTEGRATION

Submitted to:


Computer Science Laboratory
U. S. Army Engineer Topographic Laboratories
Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060

Approved for Public Release, Distribution Unlimited

March 1977

DDC
RECEIVED
APR 20 1977
REGISTRY
D

AD A 038463



AD No. _____
DDC FILE COPY.

RESEARCH LABORATORIES FOR THE ENGINEERING SCIENCES

Members of the faculty who teach at the undergraduate and graduate levels and a number of professional engineers and scientists whose primary activity is research generate and conduct the investigations that make up the school's research program. The School of Engineering and Applied Science of the University of Virginia believes that research goes hand in hand with teaching. Early in the development of its graduate training program, the School recognized that men and women engaged in research should be as free as possible of the administrative duties involved in sponsored research. In 1959, therefore, the Research Laboratories for the Engineering Sciences (RLES) was established and assigned the administrative responsibility for such research within the School.

The director of RLES—himself a faculty member and researcher—maintains familiarity with the support requirements of the research under way. He is aided by an Academic Advisory Committee made up of a faculty representative from each academic department of the School. This Committee serves to inform RLES of the needs and perspectives of the research program.

In addition to administrative support, RLES is charged with providing certain technical assistance. Because it is not practical for each department to become self-sufficient in all phases of the supporting technology essential to present-day research, RLES makes services available through the following support groups: Machine Shop, Instrumentation, Facilities Services, Publications (including photographic facilities), and Computer Terminal Maintenance.

Destroy this report when no longer needed.
Do Not return it to the originator.

The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position unless so designated by other authorized documents.

The citation in this report of trade names of commercially available products does not constitute official endorsement or approval of the use of such products.

SUBMISSION for	
NTIS	White Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DDC	Buff Section <input type="checkbox"/>
UNANNOUNCED	<input type="checkbox"/>
JUSTIFICATION.....	
BY.....	
DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODES	
Dist.	AVAIL. and/or SPECIAL
A	

DEVELOPMENT OF FINITE ELEMENT MODELS
FOR THE EARTH'S GRAVITY FIELD

PHASE I: MACRO GRAVITY MODEL FOR
SATELLITE ORBIT INTEGRATION

Contract No. DAAG 53-76-C-0067


Submitted to:

Computer Science Laboratory
Code 82000
U. S. Army Engineer Topographic Laboratories
Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060

Submitted by:

John L. Junkins
Associate Professor

Department of Engineering Science and Systems
RESEARCH LABORATORIES FOR THE ENGINEERING SCIENCES
SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING AND APPLIED SCIENCE
UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA



Report No. UVA/525023/ESS77/103

Copy No. 6

March 1977

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1.0 SUMMARY	3
2.0 PREFACE	4
3.0 INTRODUCTION.	5
4.0 FINITE-ELEMENT APPROACH	7
5.0 WEIGHTING FUNCTION APPROACH	8
6.0 LOCAL GRAVITY APPROXIMATIONS VIA TAYLOR'S SERIES.	11
7.0 LOCAL GRAVITY APPROXIMATION VIA LEAST SQUARES APPROXIMATIONS.	13
8.0 NUMERICAL TRADEOFF STUDIES.	17
9.0 PROTOTYPE FINITE-ELEMENT MODEL OF THE GEOPOTENTIAL.	20
10.0 TRAJECTORY/ORBIT INTEGRATION.	24
11.0 CONCLUSIONS	25
12.0 REFERENCES.	26

1.0 SUMMARY

As alternatives to lengthy series expansions for globally valid approximations of the earth's gravity field, piecewise approximation methods are evaluated. A single global equation is retained only for the point mass and second zonal terms of the geopotential; all finer structure undulations are modeled by a global family of locally valid functions. A degree 23 spherical harmonic series for the geopotential is replaced by finite-element approximations within the spherical shell out to 1.2 earth radii. This example application demonstrates conclusively the feasibility and desirability of the finite-element approach. An order of magnitude reduction in the calculation time for gravitational acceleration is realized over conventional calculations with spherical harmonic recursions. Preliminary investigations indicate missile trajectories and satellite orbits can be integrated efficiently and accurately using finite-element gravity representations.

2.0 PREFACE

This report constitutes the final report on Phase I of Contract DAAG-53-76-C-0067 performed by the University of Virginia for the U. S. Army Engineer Topographic Laboratories, Fort Belvoir, Virginia, under the sponsorship of the Defense Mapping Agency. The Phase I effort represents the culmination of a research and development effort initiated under Contract N00178-C00565 for the U. S. Naval Surface Weapon's Center.

The Phase I effort is concerned with replacing global gravity representations (such as spherical harmonic series) by an equivalent global family of locally valid gravity functions. In Phase II (documented in a separate report), similar methods are applied to modeling the fine structure gravitational anomalies. In both the macro (Phase I) and micro (Phase II) finite-element modeling efforts, the emphasis has been upon formulating gravity fields which are computationally efficient. In both cases gravity models have been developed by which acceleration can be calculated an order of magnitude more quickly than by traditional approaches, without significant loss of accuracy.

The author is pleased to acknowledge the capable technical guidance provided by L. A. Gambino of the U. S. Army Engineering Topographic Laboratory who served as technical monitor of this work. The computer programming and analysis support of my colleagues, Mr. J. T. Saunders and Dr. S. Ray, is gratefully acknowledged.

3.0 INTRODUCTION

Gravitational potential of an arbitrary body cannot be written as a closed expression. A number of infinite series have been formulated¹⁻³ and truncations of such series currently serve as models of the gravity field for most computational purposes. These series are identical to, or are motivated by, classical product solutions of Laplace's equation in spherical coordinates¹. One popular form of the spherical harmonic series for the geopotential at an arbitrary point (r = radius, ϕ = geocentric latitude, λ = east longitude) is

$$U = \frac{GM}{r} \sum_{n=0}^N \sum_{m=0}^n \left(\frac{R}{r} \right)^n P_n^m(\sin \phi) [C_n^m \cos m\lambda + S_n^m \sin m\lambda] \quad (1)$$

where R = a reference value of the earth's radius = 6378.160 km, GM = the earth's gravitational-mass constant = 398601.2 km³/sec², $P_n^m(X)$ = associated legendre functions (non-normalized), and C_n^m , S_n^m = gravity coefficients determined to render simulated satellite motion in best agreement with observations.

Considerable research^{2,3} has been directed toward developing stable recursion algorithms to compute Equation (1) and the south, east, and radial acceleration components as

$$\begin{aligned} G_S &= - \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial U}{\partial \phi} \\ G_E &= \frac{1}{r \cos \phi} \frac{\partial U}{\partial \lambda} \\ G_R &= \frac{\partial U}{\partial r} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

In spite of the success achieved in developing feasible algorithms based upon Equations (1) and (2) and analogous series, the increasing burden of computing acceleration from ever more lengthy global gravity models consumes an ever larger fraction of the central processor time in trajectory/orbit integrations. This fact, and other considerations have motivated research^{4,5} into other possible global gravity representations.

The present report departs from current practice by separating from the onset the two important questions: 1) What gravity representation should be fit to observed data to estimate unknown model constants from satellite observations and/or surface gravimetry (and thereby establish a global gravity field approximation)? 2) In highly repetitive gravitational calculations (e.g., computing acceleration for use in integration of satellite orbits/missile trajectories), what gravity model is most efficient computationally?

In gravitational modeling research to date, both questions have been (perhaps subconsciously) addressed simultaneously. Explicit separation of the "optimum determination" and the "optimum use" questions appears to be a most important consideration in further refinement of existing gravity models to accommodate the ever more precise and abundant observed data. Without engaging in the important quest for a model which can be best determined from observed data, we address the problem of determining an "optimum use" gravitation model.

4.0 FINITE-ELEMENT APPROACH

The dominant global features of the gravity field are efficiently represented by the dominant low-degree terms in Equation (1). This fact motivates the segregation of the total gravitational potential at a point (r, ϕ, λ) as

$$U = U_{\text{REF}}(r, \phi, \lambda) + \Delta U(r, \phi, \lambda) \quad (3)$$

where it is understood that a single low-degree truncation of Equation (1) is adopted to define U_{REF} globally. But instead of attempting to model "everything else" as a single global series, we shall determine a global family of locally valid disturbance functions to model ΔU and its gradient. Since the local equations must model only the gravity undulations (in addition to U_{REF}) in a specific local volume, it is reasonable to anticipate significantly more compact expressions than a single global expansion of comparable local accuracy. This is, of course, the thesis of the finite-element approach.

Having decided to pursue the finite-element approach, it is necessary to make several important decisions; it is necessary to define 1) what portion of the geopotential is to be approximated as ΔU in Equation (3), 2) the specific mathematical structure to use as local approximations of ΔU and its gradient, 3) the size of the finite elements, 4) the procedure to be used in determining numerical values for coefficients in the local approximations, 5) the order of continuity requirements between adjacent approximations across their mutual boundaries of validity, and 6) procedures to evaluate the validity of the finite-element model.

These decisions are coupled and affect the accuracy and efficiency of the resulting finite-element model in a complicated way. Analytical attempts to resolve these issues a priori proved unsuccessful. Therefore, guided by intuition, we have developed experimental software and, based upon systematically collected empirical data, we arrived at a prototype finite-element model of the geopotential. We present several approaches for constructing gravitational finite-element models and summarize numerical experiments with them in the following.

5.0 WEIGHTING FUNCTION APPROACH TO PIECEWISE CONTINUOUS APPROXIMATION

Recent papers⁶⁻¹⁰ document the theoretical development and application of a versatile piecewise continuous approximation technique. This weighting function approach determines an arbitrarily large family of locally valid functions which join with rigorous piecewise continuity through any prescribed order of partial differentiation. As applied to the approximation of a three variable function, $F(X_1, X_2, X_3)$ each final local approximation $\bar{F}(X_1, X_2, X_3)$ is defined as a weighted average of eight preliminary local approximations $\{f_{ijk}(X_1, X_2, X_3); i, j, k, = 0, 1\}$ as

$$\bar{F}(X_1, X_2, X_3) = \sum_{i=0}^1 \sum_{j=0}^1 \sum_{k=0}^1 W_{ijk}(X_1, X_2, X_3) \cdot f_{ijk}(X_1, X_2, X_3) \quad (4)$$

The eight preliminary approximations may have arbitrary mathematical structure (a most flexible and powerful feature of this approach) but must be determined in such a fashion that their respective centroids of validity lie at the eight vertices of a parallelepiped (in X_1, X_2, X_3 , space), which defines the volume in which the final local approximation $\bar{F}(X_1, X_2, X_3)$ is valid. The form of the weight functions can be selected^{6,7} to guarantee that \bar{F} and its similarly determined adjacent approximations are continuous across their mutual boundaries of validity; the order of partial differentiation to which continuity is desired is controlled by selecting appropriate weight functions. Specifically, Table 1 gives the weight function $W_{111}(X_1, X_2, X_3)$ for various orders of continuity.[†] The remaining seven weight functions are obtained by reflecting $W_{111}(X_1, X_2, X_3)$ as

$$W_{000}(X_1, X_2, X_3) = W_{111}(1 - X_1, 1 - X_2, 1 - X_3) \quad (5a)$$

$$W_{001}(X_1, X_2, X_3) = W_{111}(1 - X_1, 1 - X_2, X_3) \quad (5b)$$

$$W_{010}(X_1, X_2, X_3) = W_{111}(1 - X_1, X_2, 1 - X_3) \quad (5c)$$

[†]Under the assumption that X_1, X_2, X_3 are nondimensional local coordinates with $(X_1 = i, X_2 = j, X_3 = k)$ locating the eight vertices of the unit cube of validity of $F(X_1, X_2, X_3)$.

Order of Continuity m	$W_{111}(X_1, X_2, X_3)$
0	$X_1 X_2 X_3$
1	$[X_1^2(3 - 2X_1)][X_2^2(3 - 2X_2)][X_3^2(3 - 2X_3)]$
2	$[X_1^3(10 - 15X_1 + 6X_1^2)][X_2^3(10 - 15X_2 + 6X_2^2)][X_3^3(10 - 15X_3 + 6X_3^2)]$
	$\prod_{i=1}^3 X_i^4 (35 - 84X_i + 70X_i^2 - 20X_i^3)$
	$\prod_{i=1}^3 X_i^4 (35 - 84X_i + 70X_i^2 - 20X_i^3)$
.	.
.	.
.	.
m	$\prod_{i=1}^3 \left\{ \frac{(2m+1)! (-1)^m}{(m!)^2} \sum_{r=0}^m \frac{(-1)^r \binom{m}{r}}{2m-r+1} X_i^{2m-r+1} \right\}$

Table 1 Weight Function W_{111} for Various Orders of Continuity.

$$W_{100}(x_1, x_2, x_3) = W_{111}(x_1, 1 - x_2, 1 - x_3) \quad (5d)$$

$$W_{011}(x_1, x_2, x_3) = W_{111}(1 - x_1, x_2, x_3) \quad (5e)$$

$$W_{101}(x_1, x_2, x_3) = W_{111}(x_1, 1 - x_2, x_3) \quad (5f)$$

$$W_{110}(x_1, x_2, x_3) = W_{111}(x_1, x_2, 1 - x_3) \quad (5g)$$

The weight functions are positive and satisfy the constraint that

$$\sum_{i=0}^1 \sum_{j=0}^1 \sum_{k=0}^1 W_{ijk}(x_1, x_2, x_3) = 1 \quad (6)$$

They may be interpreted geometrically as follows: The maximum value W_{ijk} is unity which occurs at $x_1 = i$, $x_2 = j$, $x_3 = k$; the surfaces of constant weight are spherical in the vicinity of (i, j, k) but become increasingly angular until the surface of zero weight is the walls of the cube opposite to i, j, k . Thus, in Equation (4), W_{ijk} causes the preliminary local approximation f_{ijk} to dominate \bar{F} in the vicinity of f_{ijk} 's centroid of validity, but has no effect on \bar{F} (in value or first m partial derivatives) along the opposite cell boundary. The key to piecewise continuity is the fact that \bar{F} is completely defined (on each of the six boundary "walls") by the four preliminary approximations whose centroids are the vertices of the respective walls. Since the four preliminary approximations (defining any given cell wall) are shared by adjacent final approximations, it is clear that piecewise continuity is assured.

6.0 LOCAL GRAVITY APPROXIMATIONS VIA TAYLOR'S SERIES

Given an a priori-determined global gravity model (e.g., a spherical harmonic series), perhaps the most obvious strategy of generating local approximations is by Taylor's series. The disturbance potential and its gradient can be locally approximated as the truncated Taylor's series of three variables

$$\Delta G_{ijk}(r, \phi, \lambda) \cong \Delta G(r_i, \phi_j, \lambda_k) + \sum_{n=1}^M \sum_{I=1}^n \sum_{J=1}^{n-1} G_{IJK} X_1^I X_2^J X_3^K \quad (7)$$

where

$$\Delta G_{ijk} \cong \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \Delta U \\ -1/r (\partial(\Delta U)/\partial \phi) \\ 1/r \cos \phi (\partial(\Delta U)/\partial \lambda) \\ \partial(\Delta U)/\partial r \end{array} \right\} \cong \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \Delta U \\ \Delta G_S \\ \Delta G_E \\ \Delta G_R \end{array} \right\} \quad (8)$$

$$G_{IJK} \cong \frac{(\Delta r)^I (\Delta \phi)^J (\Delta \lambda)^K}{I!J!K!} \frac{\partial^n}{\partial r^I \partial \phi^J \partial \lambda^K} \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \Delta U \\ \Delta G_S \\ \Delta G_E \\ \Delta G_R \end{array} \right\} (r, \phi, \lambda) = (r_i, \phi_j, \lambda_k) \quad (9)$$

$K = n - I - J$, $M =$ order of the local Taylor's series. $(r_i, \phi_j, \lambda_k) =$ an arbitrary local expansion point [which is the centroid of validity of Equation (7)], $(2\Delta r, 2\Delta \phi, 2\Delta \lambda) =$ dimensions of the region of validity of Equation (7), and $(X_1, X_2, X_3) \equiv \{(r - r_i)/\Delta r, (\phi - \phi_j)/\Delta \phi, (\lambda - \lambda_k)/\Delta \lambda\} =$ nondimensional local coordinates.

The partial derivatives Equation (9) can be rigorously derived from the parent global model of ΔU . Reference 14 gives analytical expressions for computation of the partial derivatives specifically for the case that the parent global model of ΔU is a spherical harmonic series. It should be pointed out that specific numerical values for the elements of G_{IJK} are computed a priori and stored; for centroids of validity distributed over the (r, ϕ, λ) space according to some specified pattern.

In using (say) the foregoing weighting function formulation to compute local disturbance acceleration (from a piecewise continuous,

finite-element model), the appropriate, previously computed, set of G_{IJK} coefficients are employed to compute Equation (7) as preliminary local approximations for substitution into

$$\begin{Bmatrix} U(r, \phi, \lambda) \\ G_S(r, \phi, \lambda) \\ G_E(r, \phi, \lambda) \\ G_R(r, \phi, \lambda) \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{Bmatrix} U_{REF}(r, \phi, \lambda) \\ -1/r(\partial U_{REF}/\partial \phi) \\ 1/r \cos \phi (\partial U_{REF}/\partial \lambda) \\ \partial U_{REF}/\partial r \end{Bmatrix} + \sum_{i=0}^1 \sum_{j=0}^1 \sum_{k=0}^1 W_{ijk} \cdot (X_1, X_2, X_3) \Delta G_{ijk}(r, \phi, \lambda) \quad (10)$$

where

$$X_1 = (r - r_0)/\Delta r, \quad X_2 = (\phi - \phi_0)/\Delta \phi, \quad X_3 = (\lambda - \lambda_0)/\Delta \lambda$$

are nondimensional local coordinates and (r_0, ϕ_0, λ_0) are coordinates of the "lower left corner" of Equation (1)'s region of validity: $\{0 \leq X_i \leq 1; i = 1, 2, 3\}$.

The gravity representation (10) leads to a nonuniform distribution of errors over the cell volume. Observe that the approximations become exact as the displacement of the evaluation point from a centroid of validity (expansion point) decreases to zero; but more generally, the final approximation is the average of eight approximations containing errors. This observation led us to expect from the outset that Taylor's series would not be the optimum choice of preliminary approximation functions; one should seek preliminary approximations with more uniform error distributions.

7.0 LOCAL GRAVITY APPROXIMATION VIA LEAST SQUARES APPROXIMATIONS

As an alternative to the local Taylor's series [Equation (7)], we consider as the local model of disturbance gravity

$$\begin{Bmatrix} U \\ G_S \\ G_E \\ G_R \end{Bmatrix} = \sum_{n=0}^M \sum_{I=0}^n \sum_{J=0}^{n-I} \begin{Bmatrix} U_{IJK} \\ S_{IJK} \\ E_{IJK} \\ R_{IJK} \end{Bmatrix} F_{IJK}(X_1, X_2, X_3) \quad (11)$$

where $K = n - I - J$.

$$[F_{000}, F_{001}, F_{010}, F_{100}, F_{002}, F_{011}, F_{101}, F_{020}, F_{110}, F_{200}, \dots, F_{M00}(X_1, X_2, X_3)]$$

are a suitable set of linearly independent basis functions, and

$$\{U\}^T = [U_{000} U_{001} U_{010} U_{100} \dots U_{M00}],$$

$$\{S\}^T = [S_{000} S_{001} S_{010} S_{100} \dots S_{M00}],$$

$$\{E\}^T = [E_{000} E_{001} E_{010} E_{100} \dots E_{M00}],$$

$$\{R\}^T = [R_{000} R_{001} R_{010} R_{100} \dots R_{M00}],$$

are coefficients determined so that the sum square residual error (between Equation (11) and the parent model of disturbance gravity) is minimized.

In particular, if the least square coefficient estimates are determined by fitting Equation (11) to local evaluations of a global gravity model, then the coefficient estimates are given by the normal equations¹¹

$$\{U\} = [B]\{\Delta U_C\}$$

$$\{S\} = [B]\{\Delta G_S_C\}$$

$$\{E\} = [B]\{\Delta G_E_C\}$$

$$\{R\} = [B]\{\Delta G_R_C\} \quad (12)$$

where

$$[B] = [(A^T W A)^{-1} A^T W] \quad (13)$$

$$[A] \equiv \begin{bmatrix} F_{000}(X_{11}, X_{21}, X_{31}) & F_{100}(X_{11}, X_{21}, X_{31}) & \cdots & F_{M00}(X_{11}, X_{21}, X_{31}) \\ F_{000}(X_{12}, X_{22}, X_{32}) & F_{100}(X_{12}, X_{22}, X_{32}) & \cdots & F_{M00}(X_{12}, X_{22}, X_{32}) \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ F_{000}(X_{1n}, X_{2n}, X_{3n}) & F_{100}(X_{1n}, X_{2n}, X_{3n}) & & F_{M00}(X_{1n}, X_{2n}, X_{3n}) \end{bmatrix}$$

$[W] = [w_{ij}] =$ an $n \times n$ positive definite weight matrix.

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \{\Delta U_C\}^T &= \{\Delta U(X_{11}, X_{21}, X_{31}) \quad \Delta U(X_{12}, X_{22}, X_{32}) \cdots \Delta U(X_{1n}, X_{2n}, X_{3n})\} \\ \{\Delta G_S\}^T &= \{\Delta G_S(X_{11}, X_{21}, X_{31}) \quad \Delta G_S(X_{12}, X_{22}, X_{32}) \cdots \Delta G_S(X_{1n}, X_{2n}, X_{3n})\} \\ \{\Delta G_E\}^T &= \{\Delta G_E(X_{11}, X_{21}, X_{31}) \quad \Delta G_E(X_{12}, X_{22}, X_{32}) \cdots \Delta G_E(X_{1n}, X_{2n}, X_{3n})\} \\ \{\Delta G_R\}^T &= \{\Delta G_R(X_{11}, X_{21}, X_{31}) \quad \Delta G_R(X_{12}, X_{22}, X_{32}) \quad \Delta G_R(X_{1n}, X_{2n}, X_{3n})\} \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (15)$$

are local evaluations of disturbance potential and acceleration (from a parent, global gravity model) at the set of points

$$(X_{1\ell}, X_{2\ell}, X_{3\ell}) = \frac{r_\ell - r_i}{\Delta r} \frac{\phi_\ell - \phi_j}{\Delta \phi} \frac{\lambda_\ell - \lambda_k}{\Delta \lambda} \quad ; \quad \ell = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (16)$$

in the vicinity of the centroid of validity (r_i, ϕ_j, λ_k) . It has been found advantageous to generate the data (15) on a uniform grid in the local $(X_{1\ell}, X_{2\ell}, X_{3\ell})$ space; providing this grid is held identical for all cells, then Equations (13) and (14) can be computed only once and simply reused in (12) to operate upon appropriate local data to generate the entire global set of local coefficients for use in Equation (11).

An infinity of choices exist for the basis functions in (11); after some experimentation, we selected the set of all Chebyshev polynomial products up to Mth order (Table 2) as

$$\begin{Bmatrix} F_{000} \\ F_{001} \\ F_{010} \\ F_{100} \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{Bmatrix} 1 \\ T_1(X_3) \\ T_1(X_2) \\ T_1(X_1) \end{Bmatrix}$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{c} F_{002} \\ F_{011} \\ \vdots \\ F_{IJK} \\ \vdots \\ F_{MOO} \end{array} \right\} = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} T_2(x_3) \\ T_1(x_2)T_1(x_3) \\ \vdots \\ T_I(x_1)T_J(x_2)T_K(x_3) \\ \vdots \\ T_M(x_1) \end{array} \right\}$$

(17)

n	$t_n(x)$	(dt_n/dx)
0	1	0
1	x	1
2	$2x^2 - 1$	4x
3	$4x^3 - 3x$	$12x^2 - 3$
.	.	.
.	.	.
.	.	.

Recursions:

$$t_n(x) = 2x t_{n-1}(x) - t_{n-2}(x) \quad -1 \leq x \leq 1, n \geq 2$$

$$(dt_n/dx) = 2t_{n-1}(x) + 2x \frac{dt_{n-1}}{dx} - \frac{dt_{n-2}}{dx} \quad n \geq 3$$

Shifted Chebyshev polynomials:

$$T_n(Y) = t_n(2Y - 1) \quad 0 \leq Y \leq 1$$

Table 2 Chebyshev Polynomials.

8.0 NUMERICAL TRADEOFF STUDIES

To gather the empirical evidence upon which to base selections from the many alternatives implicit in the above developments, a versatile computer software system† has been developed. Figure 1 summarizes a portion of a tradeoff study whose objective is to help decide whether Taylor's series or locally fit Chebyshev polynomials should be employed as local gravity approximations. The RMS of the acceleration error norm was determined by computing the variance of a directly evaluated acceleration error sample. In this case, the sample consisted of 216 uniformly spaced error calculation points over each finite element. Using the RMS acceleration error norm as an accuracy criterion (for a given order of the local approximation) it is clear that the locally fit Chebyshev polynomials are superior to equal order Taylor's series. The very nonuniform error distribution characteristic of truncated Taylor's series (zero error at expansion point, but rapidly degrading away from that point) is partially compensated for in the weighting function approach by the bell shaped weights and redundancy of the method. However, the RMS of the locally fit Chebyshev polynomials have been found consistently superior for low order approximations (≤ 4), usually by an order of magnitude. Consideration of other goodness of fit criteria (smallness of mean error, smallness of maximum error, near Gaussian residuals, etc.), support the choice of locally fit polynomials over local Taylor's series.

Based upon the numerical experiments done thus far, the following tentative conclusions have been drawn:

- 1) Rigorous piecewise continuity of the local approximations, while desirable from conceptual and esthetic viewpoints, appears weakly justified using the small RMS error criterion. The weighted average of eight local approximations is consistently superior to any of the original approximations, but often not sufficiently superior to justify the 8:1 redundancy of the method.

†The FORTRAN IV language has been used exclusively, all computation has been carried out using the University of Virginia's Control Data Corporation CYBER 172 computer system.




Figure 1 Order of Local Approximations vs RMS Acceleration Approximation Error. ϵ = (spherical harmonic model) minus (finite-element acceleration model).

2) By fixing the order of the local approximations and selecting a specific accuracy criterion, straightforward variation in the finite-element dimensions leads quickly to the family of maximum volume elements consistent with these two constraints. Global numerical tests support the conclusion that global decisions can usually be reliably made based upon local numerical experiments, so long as the local experiments include a full range of latitude variation.

3) Analysis of repeated statistical samples of acceleration errors, (between local Chebyshev approximations and a degree 23 global spherical harmonic series) taken from various finite elements support the following conclusions regarding distribution of approximation errors: (a) The mean acceleration error has always been found to be at least one order of magnitude less than the sample RMS acceleration error, providing the sample was taken from at least 200 sample points located either on a uniform grid or randomly located within the element; and (b) The maximum acceleration error has always been found to be less than 4 times the sample RMS acceleration error, with the same sample restrictions as (3a).

9.0 PROTOTYPE FINITE-ELEMENT MODEL OF THE GEOPOTENTIAL

Based upon insight gained in parametric studies with the experimental software, a prototype finite-element model has been developed. The global finite model has the following structure:

$$\begin{Bmatrix} U(r, \phi, \lambda) \\ G_S(r, \phi, \lambda) \\ G_E(r, \phi, \lambda) \\ G_R(r, \phi, \lambda) \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{Bmatrix} U(r, \phi, \lambda) \\ G_S(r, \phi, \lambda) \\ G_E(r, \phi, \lambda) \\ G_R(r, \phi, \lambda) \end{Bmatrix}_{REF} + \sum_{n=0}^M \sum_{I=0}^n \sum_{J=0}^{n-1} \begin{Bmatrix} U_{IJK} \\ S_{IJK} \\ E_{IJK} \\ R_{IJK} \end{Bmatrix} T_I(X_1) T_J(X_2) T_K(X_3) \quad (18)$$

where

$$U_{REF}(r, \phi, \lambda) = \frac{GM}{r} \left[1 + C_2^0 \left(\frac{R}{r} \right)^2 P_2^0(\sin \phi) \right] \quad (19)$$

$$G_{SREF} = -\frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial U_{REF}}{\partial \phi} = -\frac{GM}{r^2} C_2^0 \left(\frac{R}{r} \right)^2 \frac{d}{d\phi} [P_2^0(\sin \phi)] \quad (20)$$

$$G_{EREF} = \frac{1}{r \cos \phi} \frac{\partial U_{REF}}{\partial \lambda} = 0 \quad (21)$$

$$G_{RREF} = \frac{\partial U_{REF}}{\partial r} = -\frac{GM}{r^2} \left[1 + 3C_2^0 \left(\frac{R}{r} \right)^2 P_2^0(\sin \phi) \right] \quad (22)$$

and U_{IJK} , S_{IJK} , E_{IJK} , R_{IJK} are the appropriate set of a priori computed local coefficients; computed according to Equations (12-14) with

$$F_{IJK}(X_1, X_2, X_3) = T_I(X_1) T_J(X_2) T_K(X_3)$$

to accurately replace the spherical harmonic model¹² of disturbance gravity

$$\Delta U = \frac{GM}{r} \sum_{n=2}^{23} \sum_{m=1}^n \left(\frac{R}{r} \right)^n P_n^m(\sin \phi) [C_n^m \cos m\lambda + S_n^m \sin m\lambda] \quad (24)$$

and its gradient.

Figure 2 is a projection of a global contour map of the radial disturbance acceleration $[\partial(\Delta U)/\partial r]$ on the earth's surface. To fully define the procedure for constructing the finite elements, the following decisions were made: 1) develop a finite-element model for the spherical




Figure 2 Radial Disturbance Acceleration $\frac{\partial(\Delta U)}{\partial r}$ on the Earth's Surface (contour interval = 5×10^{-5} m/sec²); at $[\lambda, \phi] = (79^\circ, 2^\circ)$, $\left. \frac{\partial(\Delta U)}{\partial r} \right|_{\max} = 1.03 \times 10^{-3}$ m/sec²;
 at $[\lambda, \phi] = (121^\circ, 3^\circ)$, $\left. \frac{\partial(\Delta U)}{\partial r} \right|_{\min} = -0.66 \times 10^{-3}$ m/sec².

shell within 1.2 earth radii; 2) adjust the finite-element size and/or the order of the local approximation so that the acceleration approximation errors enter (at worst) in the seventh significant figure; and 3) fix the order of the local approximations at $M = 3$ [in Equation (19)].

Holding the radial dimension fixed at $0.2 R$ and adjusting the longitude by latitude dimensions to maintain requirement (2) led to the set of 1500 finite-elements whose bases are shown in the flat projection of Figure 3. The acceleration error residual norm

$$\Delta G = [(GSH - GFE)^T (GSH - GFE)]^{1/2} \quad (25)$$

where

$$GSH = \begin{bmatrix} G_S \\ G_E \\ G_R \end{bmatrix} \text{ spherical harmonic series model} \quad (26)$$

$$GFE = \begin{bmatrix} G_S \\ G_E \\ G_R \end{bmatrix} \text{ finite-element model} \quad (27)$$

were computed as were its RMS and maximum value for $N = 23$ in Equations (1) and (2). We found that

$$\Delta G = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \Delta G_i = 0.0000003 \text{ m/sec}^2$$

$$RMS_{\Delta G} = \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \Delta G_i^2 \right]^{1/2} = 0.000002 \text{ m/sec}^2$$

$$\Delta G_{MAX} = 0.000008 \text{ m/sec}^2$$

$$N = 360 \times 91 = 32760 \text{ sample points (1}^\circ \times 1^\circ \text{ grid in the Northern Hemisphere)}$$

These errors are the worst case errors arising generally in the most anomalous region near the earth's surface; analogous statistical analyses reveal the magnitude of the gravity modeling errors on the surface of a $1.03 R$ sphere are about one half of the above values while the errors are reduced by order of magnitude on the surface of the $1.2 R$ sphere.




Figure 3 Distribution of Finite Elements for a 1500 Element 3rd Order Chebyshev Model of the Geopotential.

10.0 TRAJECTORY/ORBIT INTEGRATION

This level of precision has been found to be satisfactory for integration of most missile trajectories and satellite orbits; typical single revolution position integration errors have been found to be on the order of 0-25 m. Clearly, greater precision can be easily achieved, if desired, by decreasing the finite-element size (thereby increasing the number of elements), or by increasing the order of local approximations (thereby decreasing the computational efficiency of the method).

The computational speed of the finite-element model versus typical spherical harmonic recursion³ favors the finite-element model of Equation (19) by better than an order of magnitude. The computational picture is complicated, however, by virtue of the fact that random access retrieval of previously stored coefficient subsets is necessary. In this case, each component of acceleration requires a total of $(20)(1500) = 30,000$ coefficients to define the entire global family of gravity functions (although only twenty are used in each element). Since the elements are large (hundreds of miles) compared to small errors (tens of miles) associated with two body or other simplified dynamic extrapolations, simple logic can be devised to bring into central memory several local sets of coefficients before they are needed and thereby hold the lost time during random access to a minimum. For the ballistic missile problem, most of the acceleration evaluations occur in two local regions (i.e., during atmospheric powered flight, and during re-entry); thus hundreds of acceleration evaluations are likely within a single finite element. Even if no systematic pre-access scheme is used and the local coefficients are accessed each time acceleration is required, the finite-element approach still maintains an order of magnitude advantage on the UVA CYBER 172 computer system.

11.0 CONCLUSIONS

The finite-element approach to modeling the geopotential has been studied analytically and numerically. Many degrees of freedom exist in our approach to this problem. The specific finite-element model developed and discussed herein is not put forth as the optimal computational model of the geopotential. Rather, we believe the prototype finite model to be a representative finite-element geopotential model which will probably be improved upon in future refinements of our approach. The computational speed advantages over spherical harmonic expansions is clear, however (primarily because a 23rd order expansion is locally replaced by a 3rd order expansion). The ultimate computational speed advantage depends upon the number of random accesses required to maintain the appropriate local coefficients in core memory. For a given trajectory/orbit integration, simulations done to date support the conclusion that an order of magnitude savings is achieved.

12.0 REFERENCES

1. Heiskanen, W. A., and Moritz, H., Physical Geodesy, W. H. Freeman and Co., 1967, Ch. 1-3.
2. Pines, S., "Uniform Representation of the Gravitational Potential and its Derivatives," AIAA Journal, Vol. 11, Nov. 1973, pp. 1508-1511.
3. Sitzman, G. L., "A Numerical Technique to Calculate the Earth's Gravity and Its Gradient in Rectangular and Spherical Coordinates," NWL Tech. Rept., TR-2471, Feb. 1971, Dahlgren, Va.
4. Morrison, F., "A Geopotential Modeling Algorithm Using Equal-Area Surface Density Blocks." Presented to American Geophysical Union Fall Annual Meeting, San Francisco, Calif., Dec. 1974.
5. Sjogren, W. L., Wimberly, R. N., and Wollenhaupt, "Lunar Gravity: Apollo 16," Moon, Vol. II, 1974, p. 35.
6. Junkins, J. L., Miller, G. W., and Jancaitis, J. R., "A Weighting Function Approach to Modeling Irregular Surfaces," Journal of Geophysical Research, Vol. 78, April 1973, p. 1794.
7. Jancaitis, J. R., and Junkins, J. L., "Modeling N Dimensional Surfaces Using a Weighting Function Approach," Journal of Geophysical Research, Vol. 79, Aug. 1974, p. 3361.
8. Jancaitis, J. R., and Junkins, J. L., "Mathematical Techniques for Automated Cartography," University of Virginia Research Laboratories for the Engineering Sciences, Rept. ETL-CR-73-4, Feb. 1973, Charlottesville, Va.
9. Junkins, J. L., and Jancaitis, J. R., "Piecewise Continuous Surfaces: A Flexible Basis for Digital Mapping," Proceedings of the Fall 1974 Convention of the American Society of Photogrammetry.
10. Junkins, J. L., "A Finite Element Gravity Field?" Presented to the Flight Mechanics and Estimation Theory Symposium, October 15-16, 1974, NASA GSFC, Greenbelt, Md.
11. Junkins, J. L., "Optimal Estimation Theory," Navy Surface Weapons Center/Dahlgren Lab., T.N.'K'45/74, Jan. 1975, Dahlgren, Va.
12. Owen, D., personal communication, Sept. 6, 1974, Charlottesville, Va.
13. Abramowitz, M., and Stegun, I. A., Handbook of Mathematical Functions, National Bureau of Standards, Applied Math Series, Washington, D. C., No. 55, 9th Printing, 1970, pp. 773-792.

14. Junkins, J. L., "Development of a Finite Element Model of the Earth's Gravity Field," University of Virginia Research Laboratories for the Engineering Sciences, Rept. ESS-3538-105-75, Dec. 1975, Charlottesville, Va.
15. Junkins, J. L., "Investigation of Finite-Element Representations of the Geopotential," AIAA Journal, Vol. 14, No. 6, 1976, pp. 803-808.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Copy No.

1 - 50 Computer Science Laboratory
 Code 82000
 U. S. Army Engineer Topographic Laboratories
 Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060
 Attn: Mr. L. A. Gambino

51 - 55 Defense Mapping Agency Aerospace Center
 DMAAC (PRA)
 2nd and Arsenal Streets
 St. Louis, Missouri 63125

56 - 65 J. L. Junkins

 66 A. R. Kuhlthau


67 - 68 E. H. Pancake
 Science/Technology Information Center
 Clark Hall

 69 I. A. Fischer
 Office of Sponsored Programs

 70 RLES Files

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM	
1. REPORT NUMBER ETL-0096	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER	
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Development of Finite Element Models for the Earth's Gravity Field Phase I: Macro Gravity Model for Satellite Orbit Integration		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Contract Report	
7. AUTHOR(s) John L. Junkins		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER UVA/525023/ESS77/103	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Research Laboratories for the Engineering Science University of Virginia Charlottesville, Virginia 22901		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) DAAG53-76-C-0067 NEW	
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS U. S. Army Engineer Topographic Laboratories Ft. Belvoir, Virginia 22060		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS	
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		12. REPORT DATE February 1977	
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 27	
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified	
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release, distribution 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) gravity, orbit integration, inertial navigation, finite element, approximation			
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) As alternatives to lengthy globally valid series representations of the geopotential, piecewise modeling for the gravity field is investigated. A degree 23 spherical harmonic representation is replaced by 1500 local gravity functions within the spherical shell from 1 to 1.2 earth radii. Worst case acceleration errors enter in the 7th significant digit, computational speed is improved by an order of magnitude.			

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)



SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

School of Engineering and Applied Science

The University of Virginia's School of Engineering and Applied Science has an undergraduate enrollment of approximately 1,000 students with a graduate enrollment of 350. There are approximately 120 faculty members, a majority of whom conduct research in addition to teaching.

Research is an integral part of the educational program and interests parallel academic specialties. These range from the classical engineering departments of Chemical, Civil, Electrical, and Mechanical to departments of Biomedical Engineering, Engineering Science and Systems, Materials Science, Nuclear Engineering, and Applied Mathematics and Computer Science. In addition to these departments, there are interdepartmental groups in the areas of *Automatic Controls* and *Applied Mechanics*. All departments offer the doctorate; the Biomedical and Materials Science Departments grant only graduate degrees.

The School of Engineering and Applied Science is an integral part of the University (approximately 1,400 full-time faculty with a total enrollment of about 14,000 full-time students), which also has professional schools of Architecture, Law, Medicine, Commerce, and Business Administration. In addition, the College of Arts and Sciences houses departments of Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry and others relevant to the engineering research program. This University community provides opportunities for interdisciplinary work in pursuit of the basic goals of education, research, and public service.