



\cdot	
121	ND
E-	-

Technical Memorandum 30-77

HUMAN ENGINEERING LABORATORY IDENTIFICATION

FRIEND OR FOE TEST (HELIFF)

John A. Barnes

October 1977 AMCMS Code 611102.14A0011



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.

Lucion

Use of trade names in this report does not constitute an official endorsement or approval of the use of such commercial products.

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (hen Dete Entered)	
REPORT DOCUMENT	ATION PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION	NO. 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
Technical Memorandum 30-77 V		
4. TITLE (and Subtitio)		S. TTRE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVER
HUMAN ENGINEERING LABORAT	TORY IDENTIFICATION	N/ ST
FRIEND OR FOE TEST (HELIFF) .	*	Final rept.
		ORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(+)		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(*)
John A. Barnes		
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND	ADDRESS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TA
U. S. Army Human Engineering Labo	ratory 1	AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 2100	5	
		AMCMS Code 611102.14A0011
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRE		12. REPORT DATE
	V.	TS. RUEBER OF PAGES
	07	596.
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS	Il dillerent trom Controlling Otto) IS POONTY CLASS. (of this report)
		Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADIN
		SCHEDULE
Approved for public release; distribu	tion unlimited.	
Approved for public release; distribu) ition unlimited. t entered in Block 30, 11 differen	t from Report)
Approved for public release; distribu 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetrec 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES) Ition unlimited. It entered in Block 30, 11 differen	t from Report)
Approved for public release; distribu Approved for public release; distribu 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the obstreed 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse eide if nec Helicopter Identification Friend or Foe Air-to-Ground Target Detection Gunships Gunner Performance	ntion unlimited. t entered in Block 20, 11 differen crew Performance Optics Pop-Up	t from Report)
Approved for public release; distribu Approved for public release; distribu 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetree 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if nec Helicopter Identification Friend or Foe Air-to-Ground Target Detection Gunships Gunner Performance E. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if nec This study tested the ability of qualifi vehicles of the United States and its al gunners observed the vehicles from a t shows the mean time and mean range moving tactical vehicles both with the of correct identifications is also given.	tion unlimited.	t from Report) (from Report) (ber) detect and to identify moving tactical countries as either friend or foe. The gunship in the hover position. The da detection and the identification of the nd with unaided vision. The percenta
Approved for public release; distribu Approved for public release; distribu 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebetree 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde if nec Helicopter Identification Friend or Foe Air-to-Ground Target Detection Gunships Gunner Performance 5. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse elde if nec This study tested the ability of qualifi vehicles of the United States and its al gunners observed the vehicles from a t shows the mean time and mean range moving tactical vehicles both with the of correct identifications is also given.	tion unlimited. t entered in Block 20, If different t entered in Block 20, If different crew Performance Optics Pop-Up Pop-Up receive and Identify by block number ed helicopter gunners to lies and the Warsaw Pact tower which simulated a g differences between the of use of 10-power optics a	t from Report) (bor) detect and to identify moving tactica countries as either friend or foe. The gunship in the hover position. The da detection and the identification of the ind with unaided vision. The percenta

AMCMS Code 611102.14A0011

Technica Memorandum 30-77

HUMAN ENGINEERING LABORATORY IDENTIFICATION

FRIEND OR FOE TEST (HELIFF)

John A. Barnes

ACCESSION for # Frs White Section 000 1 Buti Section UNAN- BUNCED 0 JUSTIFICATION 0 .. DISTRIBUTION AVAILABILITY CODES AVAIL. and, or SPECIAL Dist.

October 1977

APPROVED IN D. WEISZ

Director U. S. Army Human Engineering Laboratory

U. S. ARMY HUMAN ENGINEERING LABORATORY Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland 21005

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

i

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The following people were responsible for the indicated tasks:

Test Director Aide	•		•	•	•	:	•	:	:	•	:	•	:	•	:	•	•	•	:	•	•	•	. N. William Doss M. Singapore
MTD Project Officer	•			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•							. LT. F. X. Barrera
Vehicle Management Aide		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	. R. I. McLaughlin
Ranging	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•		R. D. Riparip
Photography		•	•	•		•		•	•	•	•		•		•			•	•	•	•		W. T. Nemeth
Electronic Data Collec	tio	n		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	B. Amrein R. C. Brucksch
Light Measurement																							W. R. Hoafat

CARDNE W.

CONTENTS

BACKGROUND	
OBJECTIVES	
TACTICAL CONCEPT	
TEST DESIGN	
TEST PROCEDURE	
RESULTS	
DISCUSSION	
APPENDIXES	
A. Light and Contrast Values	
FIGURES	
1. Tower and Control Van	
2. Threshold Range Courses, A ¹ to T, B ¹ to T ¹ ; Response Time Courses	
3. Test Run Response Time Course A to B	
4. Test Run Response Time Course B to A	
5. Helicopter at Hover During a Tactical Pop-Up Maneuver	
TABLES	
1. AH-1 Cabin Noise Comparison	
2. HELIFF Test Procedure	
3. Subject Seating Diagram	
4. Subject Profile	

HUMAN ENGINEERING LABORATORY IDENTIFICATION

FRIEND OR FOE TEST (HELIFF)

BACKGROUND

Detection, recognition, and identification form a natural hierarchy of visual functions with detection and identification requiring, respectively, the least and the most, amount of target resolution.

a. Detection is the discovery of the presence or existence of something that has been previously hidden.

b. Recognition is being aware that the object or objects detected are of a class that could be identified as targets.

c. Identification is the verification of an object as a specific type and class. Example: Object is a US Army M-60 tank.

The relative position of Identification Friend or Foe (IFF) in the above-mentioned hierarchy is generally not clear but, in instances where good intelligence information is available, IFF may be made as early as when the target has been recognized. IFF can be defined as the visual perception of an object or an organizational unit of objects to the extent that the observer has accumulated sufficient information to assign it a specific designation of friend or foe.

The introduction of the IFF function was brought about by concern of several aspects of air-to-ground encounters with combat vehicles. These include:

a. Certain single enemy vehicles are similar to US Army vehicles.

b. Viewed from certain aspects, specific enemy vehicles and US Army vehicles are indistinguishable.

c. Friendly forces may be equipped with a mix of vehicles, some closely resembling enemy vehicles.

d. Before committing a weapon against a suspected enemy target, a gunner should attempt to decrease his uncertainty by examining other vehicles in the immediate vicinity of the suspicious looking vehicle.

There were available reasonable amounts of valid data which allowed us to state what the expected low-level and/or nap-of-the-earth target detection ranges should have been, but we felt that the actual firing ranges would be much shorter when the observer/gunner was forced to determine whether the target was a friend or a foe.

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this test were: (a) establish threshold ranges; i.e., maximum range distributions at which detection and IFF of vehicular targets can be performed given virtually

unlimited observation time; and (b) to establish detection and IFF response time distributions given a fixed range.

A complete response with regard to the objective would have required the assessing of many sensors under a variety of conditions. Factors such as dust, snow, rain, and fog which degrade the performance of sensors unequally and also geographic variations ranging from the desert to the jungle would have had to have been considered. Since the cost to test all sensors under all conditions would have been prohibitive, a modular approach to testing was followed. The current test was restricted to the following conditions:

1. Two daylight conditions were considered: unaided vision and a simulated airborne TOW sight.

2. The subjects were located in a tower which simulated a helicopter in hover during the pop-up maneuver.

3. Only operational helicopter pilot/observers were used as subjects.

4. Each target unit observed by the test subjects contained three or more operable military vehicles. All vehicles were uniquely identifiable and were in motion.

5. One background for the targets was considered; open area with trees beyond the roadways.

6. The test was conducted between mid morning and mid afternoon.

7. Weather conditions under which the test was conducted were those under which nap-of-the-earth flight could be conducted safely.

TACTICAL CONCEPT

The tactical concept of the test was one in which an airborne observer was to observe a ground unit operating in a close combat situation. The close proximity of the ground combatants had enabled the friendly units to provide the helicopter pilots with explicit information concerning the target area. The search therefore was concentrated, the approach direction was known, and the helicopter was able to operate from a vantage point.

TEST DESIGN

The effectiveness of the available sensors when used by qualified observers under controlled conditions was measured. A 6-meter tower (Figure 1) was used in the test to simulate the gunship pop-up position. The subjects were qualified pilot/observers all currently assigned to operational units.

The test was divided into two experiments: a threshold range experiment and a response time experiment. Each of these experiments were further divided into two parts: unaided vision and aided vision. In the threshold range experiment, the vehicles of the target units moved along





5 .

a straight course from A^{\dagger} to T or from B^{\dagger} to T^{} (Figure 2), through an open area some 3000 meters deep towards the observer, who indicated when he had detected the vehicles and when he had identified them as friend or foe.

In the response time experiment, the vehicles of the target unit traversed an open area from A to B (Figure 3) or from B to A (Figure 4), which formed a natural stage 900 meters from the observation tower. The observers indicated when they had detected and when they had identified the vehicles. The speed of the units was regulated and the observers were able to view the vehicles for 75 to 90 seconds depending upon the size of the unit.

The major test variables were:

run.

a. Aided and unaided vision.

b. Response time at a constant range and threshold range.

c. Target direction of motion.

The following types of data were collected:

1. Voice announcements of each observer at the time he detected the target unit and again when he identified it as friend or foe.

2. Paper tape records of each transmission initiation made by a given subject for use as a backup to the voice recordings.

3. Visibility and ambient light values during the period of testing.

4. Sun elevation and azimuth values for the testing period.

5. Target to background and foreground measures were taken during each target unit run to determine the contrast ratios.

6. The range controller recorded the target position at regular intervals during each

7. Motion pictures were taken of each run to provide qualitative information concerning the target units.

8. A subject experience profile questionnaire was completed on each of the subjects.

9. An informal observer debriefing was used to determine the subjects opinions of the test and equipment validity.

The evaluation to the data included the following:

a. The range at the target unit was detected.

b. The time at which the target unit was identified as friend or foe.

c. The number of correct responses.







The 20 subjects used in the test were qualified pilot/observers and were divided into two groups. Group I was made up of men from B, C, and D Troops 1/17 Cavalry. Group II was made up of men from A and B Troops 2/17 Cavalry, C Troop 4/9 Cavalry, and A-4, B-4 and C-4-77th AHB.

The target units were as follows:

a. Friend, Armor, US;	1. M-60 2. M-113 3. M-113 4. M-60	Camouflaged OD OD OD
b. Friend, Armor, Israel;	1. T-62 2. M-113 3. M-113 4. T-59	Camouflaged OD OD OD
c. Foe, Armor;	1. T-62 2. BTR-50 3. PRCM-1976 4. T-59	Camouflaged OD OD OD
d. Friend, Truck, US;	1. M-151 2. M-109 3. M-813 4. M-34 5. M-34	OD OD OD OD OD
e. Friend, Truck, Israel;	1. M-151 2. ZIL-157 3. KRAZ-214 4. M-813 5. M-34	OD OD Dark Green OD OD
f. Foe, Truck;	1. UAZ-69 2. ZIL-157 3. KRAZ-214 4. ZIL-130 5. GAZ-63	OD OD Dark Green OD OD

During the Group I time runs, the ZIL-157 truck would not start. To keep the truck convoy size the same for all trials, the M-109 was not used. A similar condition occurred for the last five of the Group II time runs when the T-59 had clutch problems and thus one M-60 was not used.

The 6-meter tower had an observation platform which contained approximately 15-square meters of floor space. This space was utilized for the 10 test positions and the motion picture camera position. Four of the test positions were at floor level, four were elevated 30 centimeters, and two were 60 centimeters from floor level. The test director and his assistant were also in the tower. A diesel generator located at the base of the tower provided power for the electronic equipment in the control van and also a noise level that screened the noise made by the armored vehicles. The noise level and make up was similar to that encountered in the observer's position of the current gunship at hover¹ (Table 1). The control van, located behind the tower, contained the experimenter's station, the 14-channel audio recording equipment, and the control radios.

TABLE 1

		Sound Pressure Levels in Decibels									
Canopy	Mike				Octav	ve Ba	nd Cer	nter Fre	quenci	es	
Type	Position	dBA	31.5	63	125	250	500	1000	2000	4000	8000
Slightly (AH	Curved ¹ -1S)			-	u T-d	1008	2				
Copil	ot	89.5	102	103	100	92	87	80	77	76	68
Subject I	Position 4	83.0	50	88	81	82	80	77	76	74	69
	Canopy Type Slightly (AH Copil Subject F	Canopy Mike Type Position Slightly Curved ¹ (AH-1S) Copilot Subject Position 4	Canopy TypeMike PositionSlightly Curved1 (AH-1S)Copilot89.5Subject Position 4	Canopy TypeMike PositiondBA31.5Slightly Curved1 (AH-1S)Copilot89.5102Subject Position 483.050	SourCanopy TypeMike PositionSourTypePositiondBA31.563Slightly Curved1 (AH-1S)Image: Colspan="3">Image: Colspan="3" Image: Colspan="" Image: C	Sound PCanopy TypeMike PositionOctar OctarTypePositiondBA31.563125Slightly Curved1 (AH-1S)Image: Constant AmplitudeImage: Constant AmplitudeImage: Constant AmplitudeImage: Constant AmplitudeCopilot89.5102103100Subject Position 483.0508881	Sound Pressur Canopy Mike Octave Bar Type Position dBA 31.5 63 125 250 Slightly Curved ¹ (AH-1S)	Sound Pressure Le Canopy Mike Octave Band Cer Type Position dBA 31.5 63 125 250 500 Slightly Curved ¹	Sound Pressure Levels in Canopy Mike Octave Band Center Free Type Position dBA 31.5 63 125 250 500 1000 Slightly Curved ¹ (AH-1S) .	Sound Pressure Levels in Decil Canopy Mike Octave Band Center Frequencie Type Position dBA 31.5 63 125 250 500 1000 2000 Slightly Curved ¹ (AH-1S)	Sound Pressure Levels in Decibels Canopy Mike Type Octave Band Center Frequencies Slightly Curved ¹ (AH-1S) 31.5 63 125 250 500 1000 2000 4000 Slightly Curved ¹ (AH-1S) 89.5 102 103 100 92 87 80 77 76 Subject Position 4 83.0 50 88 81 82 80 77 76 74

AH-1 Cabin Noise Comparison

All subject transmissions, all experimenter test director transmissions, and all radio transmissions were recorded. The target units were under the control of the vehicle manager, who was in radio contact with the control van at all times. The vehicle positions during tests were relayed by radio to the control van by the range controller.

TEST PROCEDURE

A typical test session proceeded as follows:

Subjects ascended the tower and were assigned their position according to the subject number they had been given at the start of the test. When they were in position, the test director and his assistant would insure that the subject's flight helmets were plugged into the recording jacks at each position. In the meantime, the experimenter was in contact by radio with the vehicle manager to insure that the proper target unit was in place with all vehicles operational. He was also in contact by radio with the range controller. When the test director notified the experimenter that the subjects and the motion picture camera operator were ready, the experimenter would alert the range controller and notify the vehicle manager to send the target unit onto the course. As the subjects detected the target unit, they would announce the fact into their microphone and it would be recorded on the tape channel for that position; they would do the same when they had identified the target unit as friend or foe. The range controller would follow the target unit's course and announce on his radio when the unit passed each of the prepositioned range markers along the course; his transmissions were recorded on the same tape as the subject responses. At the end of each test run, the vehicles of the target unit would proceed to their holding area in the woods (there were two holding areas used for each of two major tests). The subjects would move to their scheduled position for the next run and the

¹Cox, C., Edwards, B., Gaffey, T., Gibson, E., & Norman, L. AH-1S cabin noise levels with slightly curved glass. Bell Helicopter Textron, Inter-office Memo, 3 November 1976, Fort Worth, Texas.

The position schedule (Table 2) was such that each of the procedure would be repeated. subjects sat at each position for each of the visual conditions for one test run (Table 3).

The first group of 10 subjects was given the response time tests first, while the second group of 10 subjects was given the threshold range tests first. The first five of the test runs of each of the major tests were accomplished with unaided vision. The remaining five runs were accomplished with the subjects using a hand-held 10-power monocular which had a field of view that was within one half of one degree of that of the airborne TOW sight.

RESULTS

increase of the

Response Time

The mean values of the unaided-eye detection time were:

Group I	16.5	seconds,	SD	9
Group II	10.1	seconds,	SD	9

The mean values of the optics detection time were:

Group I	9.2	seconds,	SD	9
Group II	11.7	seconds,	SD	8

The mean values of the unaided-eye identification time were:

Group I		36.1	seconds,	SD	21
Group I	1	22.8	seconds,	SD	13

The mean values of the optics identification time were:

Group I	32.5	seconds,	SD	19
Group II	24.3	seconds.	SD	13

Threshold Range

The mean values of the unaided-eye detection range were:

Group I	2280 meters, SD 394	
Group II	2226 meters, SD 497	

The mean values of the optics detection range were:

Group I	2445	meters,	SD	273
Group II	2450	meters,	SD	263

The mean values of the unaided-eye identification range were:

Group I	1163	meters,	SD	591
Group II	835	meters,	SD	401

TA	BI	_E	2

HELIFF Test Procedure

DAY	RUN				POS	ITIO	N					EYE MARK	ROUTE
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
1	1	S1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	S-2	A to B
	2	S10	1	7	3	4	5	6	2	8	9	S-1	B to A
	3	S 9	10	6	7	3	4	5	1	2	8	S-10	A to B
	4	S 8	9	5	6	7	3	4	10	1	2	S-9	B to A
	5	S2	8	4	5	6	7	3	9	10	1	S-8	A to B
	6	S 6	7	8	9	10	1	2	3	4	5	TOW SIGHT	B to A
	7	S 5	6	2	8	9	10	1	7	3	4	TOW SIGHT	A to B
	8	S4	5	1	2	8	9	10	6	7	3	TOW SIGHT	A to B
	9	S3	4	10	1	2	8	9	5	6	7	TOW SIGHT	B to A
	10	S7	3	9	10	1	2	8	4	5	6	TOW SIGHT	B to A
2	1	S 6	7	8	9	10	1	2	3	4	5	S-7	A' to T
	2	S 5	6	2	8	9	10	1	7	3	4	S-6	B' to T'
	3	SL	5	1	2	8	9	10	6	7	3	S-5	A' to T
	4	S 3	4	10	1	2	8	9	5	6	7	S-4	B' to T
	5	S7	3	9	10	1	2	8	4	5	6	S-3	A' to T
	6	SI	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	TOW SIGHT	A' to T
	7	S10	1	7	3 .	4	5	6	2	8	9	TOW SIGHT	B' to T
	8	S9	10	6	7	3	4	5	1	2	8	TOW SIGHT	A' to T
	9	S 8	9	5	6	7	3	4	10	1	2	TOW SIGHT	B' to T'
	10	S2	8	4	5	6	7	3	9	10	1	TOW SIGHT	A' to T

GILCOL II	' II	Ρ	GROU
-----------	------	---	------

DAY	RUN	skon			POS	ITIC	ON					EYE MARK	ROUTE
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	A photo stato	
1	12345678910	S1 S10 S9 S8 S2 S6 S5 S4 S7	2109876543	3765482109	4376598210	54376109821	6543710982	7654321098	8 2 1 10 9 3 7 6 5 4	98210 10 13765	10 9 8 2 1 5 4 3 7 6	S-2 S-1 S-10 S-9 S-8 TOW SIGHT TOW SIGHT TOW SIGHT TOW SIGHT	A' to T B' to T' A' to T B' to T' A' to T A' to T B' to T' A' to T B' to T' A' to T
2	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	S6 S5 S4 S3 S7 S1 S10 S9 S8 S2	7654321098	8210937654	98211043765	10 98 2 1 5 4 3 7 6	1098265437	2109876543	3765487109	4376598210	54376109821	S-7 S-6 S-5 S-4 S-3 TOW SIGHT TOW SIGHT TOW SIGHT TOW SIGHT	A to B B to A B to B B to A A to B B to A A to B B to A B to A B to A

				_					
h l sù		Te	st Cour	se	<u>i</u>	3			36
SEAT 9	SEAT 10			and Service	s	EAT	Hara and	s	EAT 4
SEAT 8	SEAT 1				S	EAT		S	EAT 3
	SEAT 2			I	s	EAT		C ALL AL	
These s move c	subjects lockwise				1	These cou	e subj inter-	ects r clock	nove wise
		a ng nan na		a the Reason	man and a second	Den exponsion	a 10 7 and 10 a	Same and the	以此只是恐然出於你
				and and R.H.					

TABLE 3

The mean values of the optics identification range were:

Group I	1803	meters,	SD	430
Group II	2000	meters,	SD	466

The overall mean time values were:

Group I	12.7 seconds for detection,	SD	9
2 993 9955	34.2 seconds for identification,	SD	20
Group II	10.9 seconds for detection,	SD	8
	23.5 seconds for identification,	SD	13

The overall mean range values were:

Group I	2363 meters for detection,	SD 349
Net Easter?	1487 meters for identification,	SD 607
Group II	2338 meters for detection,	SD 413
Wat some	1453 meters for identification	SD 730

Quick detection times and long identification ranges are excellent, but when IFF is necessary it is the correctness of the identification that is paramount.

For the time series of runs the subjects scored as follows:

Group I	Unaided-eye	80% correct
Group II	Unaided-eye	84% correct
Group I	Optics	78% correct
Group II	Optics	68% correct
Group I	Overall	79% correct
Group II	Overall	76% correct

For the range series of runs, the subjects scored as follows:

Group I	Unaided-eye	68% correct
Group II	Unaided-eye	82% correct
Group I	Optics	72% correct
Group II	Optics	66% correct
Group I	Overall	70% correct
Group II	Overall	74% correct

These figures show an overall correct identification rate of 75 percent for both of the test groups. These subjects came from 10 different organizations at three different forts and should be representative of the population of US Army gunship pilot/gunners now on duty.

A breakdown of these errors by friend, US and Israel, and foe is as follows:

Group I	Unaided-eye	Friend, US	11%	Israel	6%	Foe 8%
Group II	Unaided-eye	Friend, US	3%	Israel	12%	Foe 2%
Group I	Optics	Friend, US	3%	Israel	18%	Foe 2%
Group II	Optics	Friend, US	1%	Israel	31%	Foe 1%
Overall	Unaided-eye	Friend, US	7%	Israel	9%	Foe 5%
Overall	Optics	Friend, US	2%	Israel	25%	Foe 2%

A breakdown of the errors by vehicle type is as follows:

Group I	Unaided-eye	Armored Vehicles 12%	Trucks 13%
Group II	Unaided-eye	Armored Vehicles 15%	Trucks 2%
Group I	Optics	Armored Vehicles 6%	Trucks 17%
Group II	Optics	Armored Vehicles 14%	Trucks 19%
Overall	Unaided	Armored Vehicles 14%	Trucks 7%
Overall	Optics	Armored Vehicles 10%	Trucks 18%

DISCUSSION

Each subject had a total of 20 chances to identify groups of moving vehicles as a friend or a foe; of these chances, seven were US Army vehicles, seven were enemy vehicles, and six were a mixture of US and enemy vehicles such as is used by one of our allies. Ten of the subjects were from units that had participated in the Reforger exercise in 1976. These subjects seemed to be reluctant to accept the fact that they would encounter US equipment mixed with that of other countries. This was expressed during the informal debriefing sessions and was apparent in their IFF scores; if it was a mix, it was almost always called foe. At some time in their training they had been given to understand, intentionally or not, that our allies would only be using US equipment; thus if it wasn't US, it was enemy. The other group of subjects did not have this bias.

A subject experience profile was compiled from information furnished by the subjects so that some comparisons could be made between their actual performance and their level of experience (Table 4).

The mean and median score for IFF errors was five; four of the seven pilots who had less than five errors had combat experience as did four of the seven pilots who scored more than five IFF errors.

Five pilots from Group I had fewer than five IFF errors and four had more than five. Two pilots from Group II had fewer than five errors and three had more than five IFF errors. It was also interesting to note that the two pilots who gave the most correct IFFs and the two pilots that gave the most wrong IFFs had no combat experience; their total flight experience ranged between 500 and 600 hours of helicopter flight time and all were 1975 graduates from helicopter flight training.

State State											
Subject Number	Total Time (Hours)	Helicopter Time (Hours)	Combat Time (Hours)	Instrument Time (Hours)	Age (Years)	Helicopter Rating (Year)					
1-9	600	600	0	60	25	1975					
1-4	600	500	0	80	23	1975					
1-7	1200	1200	0	150	34	1969					
1-8	1600	1600	760	100	27	1970					
I-10	1400	1400	0	140	32	1972					
1-5	1020	1000	400	75	29	1969					
1-1	1500	1500	700	30	35	1969					
1-2	2700	2400	600	220	35	1970					
1-6	1150	550	0	50	30	1975					
1-3	1200	600	0	100	26	1975					
11-5	2535	2500	1003	100	41	1968					
11-9	780	780	0	150	25	1975					
11-7	1900	1900	800	75	26	1971					
11-1	1500	1500	0	50	26	1972					
11-3	3900	3900	1000	125	30	1969					
11-4	3300	3300	1300	100	33	1969					
11-10	2800	2800	1130	100	31	1969					
11-6	2500	2500	850	200	27	1969					
11-8	2550	1700	975	75	31	1969					
11-2	2425	2300	776	200	28	1969					

TABLE 4

The results of this test continue to illustrate what has been a repeated result of the US Army Human Engineering Laboratory helicopter target acquisition tests conducted since 1972.2,3,4 This test was the first that has divided the observer's task into detection and identification. The detection ranges are similar to those of the other tests for the same flight conditions. The 1976 test⁴ against stationary camouflaged M-60 tanks in the same area of the test range at a slant range of 800 meters with the observers (Figure 5), in an actual pop-up maneuver showed a mean detection time of 50.9 seconds. This difference in mean detection times, 13.3 against 50.9, shows the advantage target movement gives to the helicopter observer.

A nap-of-the-earth detection range test was also flown against the camouflaged tank. The mean detection range was 753 meters. The current test mean detection range was 2253 meters.

²Barnes, J.A. Human Engineering Laboratory helicopter acquisition test. Technical Memorandum 20-74, US Army Human Engineering Laboratory, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, September 1974.

³Barnes, J.A. Use of the tank main gun for defense against helicopter attack. Technical Memorandum 14-76, US Army Human Engineering Laboratory, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, April 1976.

⁴Barnes, J.A., & Doss, N.W. Human Engineering Laboratory camouflage applications test. Technical Memorandum 32-76, US Army Human Engineering Laboratory, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, November 1976.



The use of optics improved the mean detection range by less than 200 meters. This same type of result was indicated in the 1975^3 tests in which a stabilized optics system was used by the helicopter and was found to be of little use in detection but was very helpful as an identification aid.

The 1972-1973 tests² were low level route reconnaissance flights against stationary military vehicles in flat, well foliated areas and in mountainous, sparsely covered areas. They showed a maximum detection range of an M-48 tank at 2320 meters with a helicopter altitude of 340 feet and a maximum detection range of 610 meters at an altitude of 220 feet; both of these figures are for the mountainous terrain.

The ran of colder impacted the neuro discussion range on the rank 200 metrics. The same enenced scale was indicated in the 1976? tests is which a stabilitied vertex syntem. The same by its indicates and was found to be at little used of stabilities but was very helpful as an indiffection and

The 1972-1973 traject were low least tours reconfigurations highly optical of theory whiters which is in the next tonated at an in a constant of a constant which is a second to the first of the thought is monimum detection they at as 14.46 and 202.29 motion with a million part of both of 340 feet and a maximum detection they at as 14.46 and 202.29 motion with a million part of both of both the and a maximum detection they at a 14.46 and 200 motion with a million of the both the and a maximum detection they of \$10 million at an alticulated \$20 notes to the both the and a maximum detection they of \$10 million an alticulated \$20 notes to the both the and a maximum detection they are set as a set of \$10 million at the set of \$10 not the set

.

. 1

APPENDIX A

LIGHT AND CONTRAST VALUES

PROCEDURE

Ambient light levels (footcandles) were measured using a model 1960 Spectra Pritchard photometer. The photometer detector unit, equipped with a cosine corrected integrating attachment, was aimed vertically upward; this placed the photometer reference surface in a horizontal plane. Under the above conditions, the measured illumination represented the light levels in a horizontal plane, which resulted from light incident from the hemisphere (sky) directly above.

Sky brightness (footcandles/ster) was derived from the illumination measurements by dividing the latter by the factor π (Pi).

Sky brightness measurements (footlamberts) taken in conjunction with the target array versus background readings, used to compute target contrast, were measured directly by using a photometer which was aimed at the portion of the sky relevant to the test.

Target contrast (dynamic contrast) was determined from luminance (foot lambert) measurements taken on the target vehicles and their associated backgrounds. These measurements were taken while the vehicles were proceeding in a target array and along a course specified in a time/run schedule for this test. The targets were measured while in motion, when they were in view, simultaneously, of the light measurements group and the observers participating in an adjunct test phase of this test. The photometer was aimed at the targets, along a line-of-sight parallel to that of the observers, and after the last target was measured, background readings were taken. Target contrast was calculated by the equation:

Contrast = High Luminance - Low Luminance High Luminance

Illumination levels measured are representative of the light levels at the test location.

Sky brightness (footcandle/ster) is representative of the average brightness of the sky at the test site. This data was calculated rather than measured, since direct measurement would only measure a small portion of the sky (2°) .

Contrast measurements were taken while the target was in motion and proceeding in an array along a preselected test course. This posed a problem when preceding along a dirt road. The leading vehicle would stir up enough dust or smoke to completely engulf, in a mist of suspended particles, the other following vehicle(s). As a result, the contrast readings eventually calculated from these data would seem to be scattered without any correlation among several measurements taken on the same vehicle or other vehicle in the group. It is felt, however, that these measurements do, indeed portray the conditions of the test and should correlate closely with the visual data collected in the visible region of spectrum.

The illumination and sky brightness data were representative of the conditions existing at the test site for the time of year and season.

Figure 1A illustrates the sun's azimuth and altitude during the testing periods.

Date of		Luminance o Trees	of the Field, F Trees	ootlamber	ts x 102 Grass		Lun	ninance of the Footlambert	he Targets is x 10 ²		4
(1977)	Time	Background	Background	Surface	Foreground	Sky				3 100 15 100	
23 May	1510	2.05	6.85	14.7 ^a	5.64	20.0	M60 3.15	<u>M113</u> 3.72	M113 3.05	<u>M60</u> 3.24	
	1522	2.70	8.37	16.2 ^a	7.22	20.8	<u>T62</u> 4.78	<u>M113</u> 4.20	<u>M113</u> 3.14	<u>T59</u> 3.66	
	1535	1.82	8.62	9.25ª	4.13	17.50	<u>T62</u> 2.39	<u>M1967</u> 3.51	BTR50 2.34	<u>T59</u> 3.74	
24 May	0920	2.11	5.30	8.27ª	4.94	16.45	UAZ69 2.41	KRAZ214 1.41	ZIL130 1.82	<u>GAZ63</u> 2.43	
	1035	3.53	12.16	10.04 ^a	7.09	23.1	JEEP Lost	5-TON 4.00	<u>6x6</u> 3.06	<u>6x6</u> 3.10	4
1100	1050	3.08	8.50	12.64 ^a	7.63	23.2	<u>T62</u> 3.43	<u>M1967</u> 4.30	BTR50 2.92	<u>T59</u> 2.66	
	1100	2.66	6.81	11.11ª	5.60	21.0	UAZ69 3.33	KRAZ214 1.45	ZIL130 1.83	<u>GAZ63</u> 2.97	
	1110	10-10-00	Seed- Off		-	1.1	T62 Lost	M113 Lost	M113 Lost	T59 Lost	
	1115	2.78	9.61	14.30 ^a	7.13	22.0	<u>M60</u> 3.14	<u>M113</u> 2.68	<u>M113</u> 2.90	<u>M60</u> 2.18	4
	1125	3.61	8.52	17.64 ^a	7.34	23.4	JEEP 3.22	KRAZ214 1.83	5-TON 2.19	6x6 2.71	
	1355	-	5.82	19.70 ^b	9.63	22.7	<u>T62</u> 8.80	<u>T59</u> 9.70	BMP-A 2.85	BTR50 2.41	
	1433	-	5.46	8.25 ^c	7.48	22.5	<u>JEEP</u> 6.09	5-TON 4.23	<u>6x6</u> 3.60	6x6 3.34	
	1450	-	3.53	6.79 ^b	6.79	21.2	<u>T62</u> 7.29	T59 8.30	<u>M113</u> 7.50	M113 6.99	
1.1.1	1515	an <u>t</u> erned	3.49	8.24 ^c	6.69	18.19	UAZ69 3.27	KRAZ214 3.15	ZIL130 3.60	GAZ63 3.90	
	1530	-	4.86	13.54 ^b	5.62	17.07	<u>M60</u> 3.40	<u>M60</u> 3.70	<u>M113</u> 6.32	<u>M113</u> 7.18	
25 May	0920	0 1 200 a 2	1.64	3.80 ^b	2.38	7.13	<u>T62</u> 1.96	<u>T59</u> 1.50	<u>M113</u> 1.39	M113 1.47	12 14 - 14
	0940	-	2.01	6.72 ^c	3.58	9.22	<u>JEEP</u> 1.35	ShopVan 1.55	5-TON 1.51	6x6 1.32	6x6 1.27
	0955	-	2.30	6.89b	3.85	10.40	<u>M60</u> 3.00	M60 2.45	M113 2.89	M113 2.85	
	1013	-	3.31	9.24 ^c	5.73	14.6	<u>IEEP</u> 2.20	ZIL157 3.90	KRAZ214 2.20	5-TON 2.11	6x6 2.09
12.34	1039	and the state of	2.07	7.19b	3.75	15.9	<u>T62</u> 3.27	T59 4.57	BMP-A 3.28	BTR50 3.17	1
	1335	-	2.59	4.91b	3.23	9.48	<u>T62</u> 3.18	T59 2.50	BMP-A 2.53	BTR50 1.90	

LUMINANCE DATA

^aMixture of clay, gravel and sand.

bBare earth.

CMacadam.

(Continued)

Date of		Luminance Trees	of the Field, F	ootlamber	ts x 10 ² Grass	ien.T Mint	Lur	ninance of Footlamb	the Targets erts x 10 ²	T	
(1977)	Time	Background	In Far Background	Surface	In The Foreground	Sky	JEEP	ShopVan	5-TON	6x6	6x6
25 May	1351		3.09	8.72 ^c	3.48	13.30	2.14	2.02	1.76	1.66	1.58
	1419		2.07	5.30b	3.44	13.30	<u>T62</u> 2.80	<u>T59</u> 2.79	<u>M113</u> 2.40	M113 2.28	
	1439		2.14	11.20¢	4.05	17.70	UAZ69 2.51	ZIL157 3.04	<u>KRAZ214</u> 2.20	ZIL130 2.18	GAZ63 2.40
	1458		2.00	7.08b	4.70	17.00	<u>M60</u> 3.52	<u>M60</u> 2.77	M113 3.36	<u>M113</u> 4.46	
26 May	0936		3.40	14.20b	7.17	21.9	<u>T62</u> 5.71	<u>T59</u> 7.12	<u>M113</u> 5.34	<u>M113</u> 5.21	
	0958		3.36	10.30 ^c	6.65	21.3	<u>JEEP</u> 2.05	ShopVan 2.57	5-TON 1.46	6x6 1.40	6x6 1.50
	1016	63.	3.36	17.40b	6.50	20.7	<u>M60</u> 8.20	M60 6.08	<u>M113</u> 7.93	<u>M113</u> 8.22	
	1036		3.33	10.30 ^c	6.65	20.0	<u>JEEP</u> 2.40	ShopVan 3.20	KRAZ214 2.20	5-TON 1.70	6x6 1.60
1:28	1053	-	3.20	20.9b	6.40	19.10	<u>T62</u> 7.90	<u>T59</u> 11.00	<u>BMP-A</u> 7.50	BTR50 7.24	
	1335	2.30	7.42	15.12ª	7.84	18.75	<u>M60</u> 7.34	M113 7.30	M113 10.60	<u>M60</u> 8.90	
	1345	2.21	8.27	16.26 ^a	7.36	12.33	<u>T62</u> 8.50	M113 10.53	M113 9.90	T59 9.80	
	1355	2.35	7.33	16.17ª	7.86	14.40	<u>T62</u> 7.90	M1967 10.00	BTR50 8.90	T59 11.60	
	1455	3.39	7.25	17.30ª	8.34	19.00	<u>UAZ69</u> 6.80	ZIL157 8.30	KRAZ214 6.90	ZIL130 7.59	GAZ63 12.16
1.5.88	1505	3.39	7.25	17.30a	8.34	19.00	<u>JEEP</u> 6.90	ShopVan 4.19	5-TON 8.96	6x6 10.16	6x6 12.08
27 Mayd	-					-	T62 Lost	M1967 Lost	BTR50 Lost	T59 Lost	
100	0950	1.72	5.20	7.99a	6.01	22.9	UAZ69 2.30	ZIL157 2.99	KRAZ214 3.62	ZIL130 5.90	GAZ63 7.70
	0957	2.11	4.42	7.18ª	6.52	22.7	<u>T62</u> 2.90	M113 1.70	M113 1.42		
80	1002	2.38	5.58	7.02ª	6.41	21.5	M60 3.70	M113 5.71	M113 9.97		
100	1007	2.88	5.40	7.12 ^a	6.65	22.2	<u>JEEP</u> 3.20	ZIL157 4.18	KRAZ214 5.91	5-TON 5.19	6x6 9.60

LUMINANCE DATA

(Concluded)

^aMixture of clay, gravel and sand.

^bBare earth.

^cMacadam

dNote: 26 and 27 May only: The cumulative dust cloud is responsible for the high readings obtained on the trailing vehicles.

		Contrast of Target Vehicle With Respect To:									
Date of Test (1977)	Time	Target Vehicle	Trees In Near Background	Trees In Far Background	Road Surface	Grass In The Foreground	Sky				
23 May	1510	M60 M113 M113 M60	.34 .44 .33 .37	.54 .46 .55 .53	.79a .75a .79a .78a	.44 .34 .46 .43	.84 .81 .85 .84				
	1522	T62 M113 M113 T59	.44 .36 .14 .26	.43 .50 .62 .56	.70a .74a .81a .77	.34 .42 .57 .49	.77 .80 .85 .82				
	1535	T62 M1967 BTR 50 T59	.24 .48 .22 .51	.72 .59 .73 .57	.74a .62a .75a .60a	.42 .15 .43 .09	.86 .80 .87 .79				
24 May	0920	UAZ 69 KRAZ 214 ZIL 130 GAZ 63	.12 .33 .14 .13	.55 .73 .66 .54	.71a .83a .78a .71a	.51 .71 .63 .51	.85 .91 .89 .85				
	1035	JEEP 5-TON 6 x 6 6 x 6	Lost .12 .13 .12	Lost .67 .75 .75	Lost .60a .70a .69a	Lost .44 .57 .56	Lost .83 .87 .87				
	1050	T62 M1967 BTR 50 T59	.10 .28 .05 .14	.59 .49 .66 .69	.73a .66a .77a .79a	.55 .44 .62 .65	.85 .81 .87 .89				
	1100	UAZ 69 KRAZ 214 ZIL 130 GAZ 63	.20 .45 .31 .10	.51 .79 .73 .56	.70a .87a .88a .73a	.41 .74 .67 .47	.84 .93 .91 .86				
	1110	T62 M113 M113 T59	Lost Lost Lost Lost	Lost Lost Lost Lost	Lost Lost Lost Lost	Lost Lost Lost Lost	Lost Lost Lost Lost				
1777 14	1115	M60 M113 M113 M60	.11 .04 .04 .22	.67 .72 .70 .77	.78 ^a .81 ^a .80 ^a .85 ^a	.56 .62 .59 .69	.86 .88 .87 .90				
l	1125	JEEP KRAZ 214 5-TON 6 x 6	.11 .49 .39 .25	.62 .79 .74 .68	.82a .90a .88a .85a	.56 .75 .70 .63	.86 .92 .91 .88				
abractoria	1355	T62 T59 BMP-A BTR 50		.34 .40 .51 .59	.55b .51b .86b .88b	.09 .01 .70 .75	.61 .57 .87 .89				

CONTRAST

^aMixture of clay, gravel and sand. ^bBare earth.

(Continued)

CONTRAST

Date of Test		Target	Trees In Near	rast of Target Ve Trees In Far	Road	Grass In The	
(1977)	Time	Vehicle	Background	Background	Surface	Foreground	Sky
24 May	1433	JEEP 5-TON 6 x 6 6 x 6		.10 .23 .34 .39	.26° .49° .56° .60°	.19 .43 .52 .55	.73 .81 .84 .85
	1450	T62 T59 M113 M113		.52 .57 .53 .49	.07b .18b .09b .03b	.07 .18 .09 .03	.66 .61 .65 .67
	1515	UAZ 69 KRAZ 214 ZIL 130		.06 .10 .03	.60° .62° .56°	.51 .53 .46	.82 .83 .80
	1530	M60 M60 M113 M113		.11 .30 .24 .23 .32	.75b .73b .53b .47b	.42 .40 .34 .11 .22	.80 .78 .63 .58
25 May	0920	T62 T59 M113 M113		.16 .09 .15 .10	.48b .61b .63b .61b	.18 .37 .42 .38	.73 .79 .81 .79
	0940	JEEP Shop Van 5-TON 6 x 6 6 x 6		.33 .23 .25 .34 .37	.80° .77° .78° .80° .81°	.62 .57 .58 .63 .65	.85 .83 .84 .86 .86
	0955	M60 M60 M113 M113		.23 .06 .20 .19	.56b .64b .58b .59b	.22 .36 .25 .26	.71 .76 .72 .73
	1013	JEEP ZIL 157 KRAZ 214 5-TON 6 x 6		.34 .15 .34 .36 .37	.76° .58° .76° .77° .77°	.57 .24 .57 .59 .59	.85 .73 .85 .86 .86
	1039	T62 T59 BMP-A BTR 50		.37 .55 .37 .35	.55b .36b .54b .56b	.13 .18 .13 .15	.79 .71 .79 .80
は記録	1335	T62 T59 BMP-A BTR 50		.19 .04 .02 .27	.35b .49b .48b .61b	.02 .23 .22 .41	.66 .74 .73 .80
1	1351	JEEP Shop Van S-TON 6 x 6 6 x 6	-	.31 .35 .43 .46 .49	.75° .77° .80° .81° .82°	.39 .42 .49 .52 .55	.84 .85 .87 .88 .88

^aMixture of clay, gravel and sand. ^bBare earth.

^CMacadam

(Continued)

CONTRAST

			Contrast of Target Vehicle With Respect To:								
Date of Test (1977)	Time	Target Vehicle	Trees In Near Background	Trees In Far Background	Road Surface	Grass In The Foreground	Sky				
25 May	1419	T62 T59 M113	=	.26 .26 .14	.47b .47b .55b	.19 .19 .30	.79 .79 .82				
	1439	UAZ 69 ZIL 157 KRAZ 214 ZIL 130		.15 .30 .03 .02	.78c .73c .80c .81c	.34 .38 .25 .46 .46	.85 .86 .83 .88 .88				
	1458	GA2 63 M60 M113 M113		.11 .43 .28 .40 .55	.50b .61b .53b .37b	.41 .25 .41 .29 .05	.86 .79 .84 .80 .74				
26 May	0936	T62 T59 M113 M113		.40 .52 .36 .35	.60b .50b .62b .63b	.20 .01 .26 .27	.74 .67 .76 .76				
	0958	JEEP Shop Van 5-TON 6 x 6 6 x 6		.39 .24 .57 .58 .55	.80° .75° .86° .86° .85°	.69 .61 .78 .79 .77	.90 .88 .93 .93				
	1016	M60 M60 M113 M113		.59 .45 .58 .59	.53b .65b .54b .53b	.21 .06 .18 .21	.60 .71 .62 .60				
()	1036	JEEP Shop Van KRAZ 214 5-TON 6 x 6		.28 .04 .34 .49 52	.77¢ .69¢ .79¢ .83¢ 84¢	.64 .52 .67 .74 76	.88 .84 .89 .92				
24	1053	T62 T59 BMP-A BTR 50		.59 .71 .57 .56	.62b .47b .64b .65b	.19 .42 .15 .12	.59 .42 .61 .62				
	1335	M60 M113 M113 M60	.69 .68 .78 .74	.01 .02 .30 .17	.51a .52a .30a .41a	.06 .07 .26 .12	.61 .61 .43 .53				
58. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1345	M113 M113 T59	.74 .79 .78 .77	.03 .21 .16 .16	.48ª .35ª .39ª .40ª	.13 .30 .26 .25	.31 .15 .20 .21				

^aMixture of clay, gravel and sand. ^bBare earth. ^cMacadam

(Continued)

			Cont	trast of Target Ve	hicle With	Respect To:	
Date of Test (1977)	Time	Target Vehicle	Trees In Near Background	Trees In Far Background	Road Surface	Grass In The Foreground	Sky
26 May	1355	T62 M1967 BTR 50 T59	.70 .77 .74 .80	.07 .27 .18 .37	.51a .38a .45a .28a	.01 .21 .12 .32	.45 .31 .38 .19
tines ingin close shine here close to even close the second to desecond	1455	UAZ 69 ZIL 157 KRAZ 214 ZIL 130 GAZ 63	.50 .59 .51 .55 .72	.06 .13 .05 .04 .40	.61a .52a .60a .56a .30a	.18 .00 .17 .09 .31	.64 .56 .64 .60 .36
eta jun han han han	1505	JEEP Shop Van 5-TON 6 x 6 6 x 6	.51 .19 .62 .67 .72	.05 .42 .19 .29 .40	.60a .76a .48a .41a .30a	.17 .50 .07 .18 .31	.64 .78 .53 .47 .36
27 May	0925	T62 M1967 BTR 50 T59	Lost Lost Lost Lost	Lost Lost Lost Lost	Lost Lost Lost Lost	Lost Lost Lost Lost	Lost Lost Lost Lost
Andreas Land Contrologi Controlog	0950	UAZ 69 ZIL 157 KRAZ 214 ZIL 130 GAZ 63	.25 .42 .52 .71 .78	.56 .43 .30 .12 .32	.71a .63a .55a .26a .04a	.62 .50 .40 .02 .22	.90 .87 .84 .74 .66
Marco Ma Marco Marco Mar Marco Marco	0957	T62 M113 M113	.27 .19 .33	.34 .62 .68	.60a .76a .80a	.56 .74 .78	.87 .93 .94
n ann Maiste Talaiste	1002	M60 M113 M113	.36 .58 .76	.34 .02 .44	.47a .19a .30a	.42 .11 .36	.88 .73 .54
Second Second	1007	JEEP ZIL 157 KRAZ 214 5-TON 6 x 6	.10 .31 .51 .45 .70	.41 .23 .09 .04 .44	.55a .41a .17a .27a .26a	.52 .37 .11 .22 .31	.86 .81 .73 .77 .56

CONTRAST

^aMixture of clay, gravel and sand.

a general de

^bBare earth. ^CMacadam

120.27

(Concluded)

	Constant of	Alter states in	144 DE 10 2040	Calculated S	ky Brightness	
Date of Test	Time	Illuminat	ion	Foot Candle	Lux/Staradian	Pemarke
(1977)	lime	Foot Candle	Lux	Steradian	Lux/Steradian	Kemarks
23 May	0900	2.9x103	31.2x103	0.922x103	9.93x103	Overcast
	0930	2.9x103	31.2x10 ³	0.922x10 ³	9.93x10 ³	Overcast
	1000	4.3x103	46.3x103	1.37x10 ³	14.7x10 ³	Partial cloud
	1030	3.0x103	32.3x103	0.956x10 ³	10.3x10 ³	Overcast
	1100	7.4x103	79.6x10 ³	2.36x103	25.3x103	Sun thru light cloud
	1130	8.6x103	92.5x103	2.74x10 ³	29.4x10 ³	Sun thru light cloud
12.2	1300	8.8x103	94.7x103	2.80x10 ³	30.1x10 ³	Sun thru light cloud
100	1330	6.4x103	68.9x10 ³	2.04x10 ³	21.9x10 ³	Slight overcast
080 010-01	1400	5.8x103	62.4x10 ³	1.85x10 ³	19.9x10 ³	Slight overcast
10.1	1430	5.8x103	62.4x10 ³	1.85x10 ³	19.9x10 ³	Slight overcast
1	1500	3.8x103	40.9x10 ³	1.21x10 ³	13.0x10 ³	Cloudy
10.00	1530	4.3x10 ³	46.3x10 ³	1.37x10 ³	14.7x10 ³	Cloudy
24 May	0830	1.85x103	19.9x103	0.588x103	6.33x10 ³	Overcast
	0900	2.45x103	26.4x10 ³	0.780x10 ³	8.40x10 ³	Overcast
14	0930	3.80x103	40.9x103	1.21x103	13.0x10 ³	Some clear sky
	1000	3.40x103	36.6x103	1.09x103	11.7x10 ³	Some clear sky
10.5	1030	5.90x103	63.5x103	1.88x10 ³	20.2x10 ³	Some clear sky
0.0	1100	5.40x103	58.1x103	1.72x10 ³	18.5x103	Slight overcast
14.1	1130	9.20x103	99.0x103	2.94x103	31.5x10 ³	Bright sun
	1300	5.7x103	61.3x10 ³	1.92x10 ³	19.5x103	Sky overcast
	1330	4.5x103	48.4x103	1.43x10 ³	15.4x103	Sky overcast
- 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1	1400	6.5x103	69.9x103	2.06x103	22.2x103	Light overcast
	1430	4.6x103	49.5x103	1.46x103	15.8x103	Overcast
10	1500	3.8x103	40.9x103	1.21x103	13.0x103	Overcast
	1530	3.5x103	37.7x10 ³	1.11x10 ³	12.0x10 ³	Overcast
25 May	0830	7.6x102	8.18x103	2.42x102	2.60x103	Very light shower
120	0900	7.4x102	7.96x103	2.36x10 ²	2.53x10 ³	Shower
	0930	2.1x103	22.6x103	0.668x103	7.19x103	Overcast
	1000	2.7x103	29.1x103	0.858x103	9.26x103	Overcast
	1030	2.5x103	26.9x103	0.796x103	8.56x103	Overcast
	1100	2.8x103	30.1x103	0.892x103	9.58x103	Light shower
12.	1130	2.0x103	21.5x103	0.636x103	6.84x103	Light shower
13	1300	2.75x103	29.6x103	0.876x103	9.42x103	Rain
1. A. A. A. A.	1330	2.1x103	22.6x103	0.668x103	7.19x103	Rain
	1400	2.45x103	26.4x103	0.780x103	8.40x103	Rain
	1430	2.45x103	26.4x103	0.780x103	8.40x103	Overcast
and the second	1500	3.2x103	34.4x103	1.02x103	10.9x103	Overcast
26 May	0830	4.0x103	43.0x103	1.27x103	13.7x103	Clear
	0900	4.55x103	49.0x103	1.45x103	15.6x103	Clear
	0930	5.4x103	58.1x103	1.72x103	18.5x103	Clear
	1000	6.0x103	64.6x103	1.91x103	20.6x103	Clear
	1030	6.7x103	72.1×103	2.14x103	23.0x103	Clear
	1050	7.4×103	79.6×103	2.36x103	25.3×103	Clear
	1120	7.7×103	82.9×103	2.46x103	26.4x103	Clear
13 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1300	8.65×103	93 1 103	2.74×103	29.6x103	Clear
	1330	8 8 103	94 7 103	2.80x103	30.1×103	High light clouds
	1400	8 5×103	91 5-103	2 70-103	29 1 103	High light clouds
	1430	8.3×103	89.3-103	2.64 103	28.4x103	Haze
10-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-1	1500	8 0x103	86 1 103	2 54 103	27.4×103	Clear
	1500	0.0410-	00.1110-	2.54X10		JIUM

ILLUMINATION

(Continued)

L

				Calculated S	Calculated Sky Brightness		
Date of Test (1977)	Time	Illumination Foot Candle Lux		Foot Candle Steradian	Lux/Steradian	Remarks	
27 May	0830 0900 0930 1000	3.8x103 4.6x103 5.4x103 6.1x103	40.9x103 49.5x103 58.1x103 65.6x103	1.21x10 ³ 1.46x10 ³ 1.72x10 ³ 1.94x10 ³	13.0x103 15.8x103 18.5x103 20.9x103	Bright sun Bright sun Bright sun Bright sun	

ILLUMINATION

(Concluded)



APPENDIX B

COMPUTER PRINT OUT OF RAW DATA

A ...

. .

THRESHOLD RANGE DATA ,

RUN

GROUP	SEAT	DETECTION	IDENTIFICATION	SUBJECT
1	1	1915 0	841.0	6
t	2	2398 0	655.0	7
i	3	2237.0	2192.0	8
1	4	2559 0	1605.0	9
:	5	2117 0	1710.0	10
1	<u>.</u>	2607.0	466 0	1
1	A PAG WAR TO T	, 2581 0	98.00 884.0	2
	Ŕ	2720 0	1306.0	3

· 1	1	ó	2607.0	466 0	1
1	1 , /	Ten WAR TO 1	2581 0	884.0	2
1	•	8	2720 0	1306.0	3
1	i	9	, 2720.0	869.0	4
1	1	10	2422.0	1713.0	5 _
2	1	1	2126.0	741.0	5
2	1	2	1702.0	466.0	6
2	i	3	2402.0	597.0	2
2	1	4 ·	2016.0	880.0	8
2	1	5	1947 0	1013.0	9
2	1	. 6	2109.0	775.0	10
2	1	7	2303 0	0.0	1
2	1	3	1969.0	466.0	7
2	1	9	1735.0	526.0	3
2	. 1	10	2132 0	543.0	4
3	1	1	2141.0	2141.0	4
3	+ 1	2	2653.0	1608.0	5
3	1	3	2663.0	841.0	1

1	1		1110.0	1005.0	2
· 3	1	5	2608.0	1346.0	
3	1		2636.0	2615.0	
3	1	2	1932 0	1933 0	10
3	1	3115	2512.0	900.0	
3	1		2637 0	798 0	7
3	1	10	2575 0	1375 0	3
4		1	1928.0	960.0	3
4		.2	2383 0	950.0	11111
4	1	3	933.0	933.0	10
4	1		2301.0	<u>0.0</u>	
4	1	5	2376 0	466.0	2
4	1	6	1773.0	949.0	
4	.1	7	2099.0	627.0	9
4	1	8	2424.0	613.0	5
4	1	9 .	1946 0	518.0	6
4	. 1	10	2139.0	664.0	7
5	1	L. C.	2638 0	1643.0	7
5	1	2	2503 0	1346 0	3
5	1	3	2578 0	2237_0	9
5	8. 11		1915 0	1818 0	10
5	·	<u> </u>	2652.0	856.0	
5	· 1	6	2647.0	1375.0	2
5	0	7	.2623 0	982 0	
5	1	88	2688 0	2586.0	
· <u>5</u>		<u>a</u>	2660 0	1890.0	5
5	a the fail	10	2633 0	1025 0	
<u> </u>	1	<u> </u>	2576 0	2076_0	
6	1	2	2541.0	2142.0	2

- apiete)

			BEST AVA	ILABLE CO	PY
	1		2498.0	2061.0	······································
. 6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1	2561.0	1610.0	4
		5	2558.0	2076.0	5
		6	2537.0	788.0	6
6		7	2116.0	1915.0	7
	an a	8	2483.0	2044.0	8
6	· ····································	·······	2560.0	2120.0	9
		10	1882.0	1819.0	10
	and the second	1	1453.0	1372.0	10
7	1	2	2609.0	0.0	1
7	1	3	2631.0	1501.0	1
			2571.0	2425.0	3
		5	2692.0	1660.0	4
7	1	6	2051.0	1432.0	5
	1		2480.0	1465.0	6
7		6	2491.0	1612.0	2
7	. 1	9	2096.0	1468.0	8
7		10	2656.0	1432.0	9
. 3			2377.0	2377.0	9
	1	2.81	2385.0	2159.0	10
	me and all the same	3	2555 0	1915.0	6
		4	2559.0	1990.0	7
8	······································	5	2559.0	1858.0	3
9	1	S	2682.0	1777.0	
		7	2605.0	2030.0	5
		8	2668.0	1915.0	1
8		9	2189.0	1940.0	2
8	and a straight and a straight a	10	2591.0	2270.0	8

1.8%

	BEST	AVAII	ARIF	COPY		
9	ber there i	1	ad where there than	1993.0	1346.0	
9		1	2	2362 0	2164.0	
9		1.	. 3	2577.0	2023.0	
9		1	_	2575 0	561.0	
9		1	5	2497 0	1750.0	
9		1	6	2524 0	2828 0	
9		1	7	2603 0	1772.0	
9		1	8	1986 0	1755_0	1
9	and the second second	1	9	2522 0	950_0	
9		1	10	2376 0	831_0	;
10		1	1	2413 0	1490.0	;
10	- Langing g	1	2	2622 0	1630 0	
10		1	3	2554 0	2422 0	
10		· 1	4	2645 0	2304 0	
1.0		<u> </u>	5	1593 0	1593 0	
10		1	6	2646 0	1936 0	
10		1		26.09 0	2267_0	
10	in the second	1		2658 0	2658 0	
10		1		2574 0	1925 0	U
10		1	10	2692 0	1704_0	
1		2		2294 0	4 B B D	
1	rain marker	2	2	2516 0	949 0	
	Anne ann an the second se	2	3	2543 0	545.0	
	an a	2		2241 0	466 0	<u></u>
		2	5	2542 0	466 0	
<u> </u>		2	b	1188 0	466.0	in den den er
1		.2	7	2514 0	466 0	Surgeon provinción
_1		2	8	2411 0	627.0	
1	Re	2	,	2525 0	762 0	

1 -	2	10	2542.0	627.0	10
2	2	1	2473.0	1432.0	10
2	2	2	2067.0	466.0	1
2	2	3	2345 0	853.0	7
2	2	4 4 4	2370.0	731.0	3
2	2	5	2328.0	2173.0	4
2	2	6	2371.0	1271.0	5
2	2	7	1593.0	1260.0	6
2	2	8	2336.0	1271.0	2
2	2	9	555.0	466.0	8
5	-2	10	2438.0	466.0	9
3	2	1	2620 0	826.0	9
3	2	2	2650 0	830.0	10
3	2	3	1950.0	839.0	6
3	2	4	2685.0	607.0	7
3	2	5	2628.0	1625.0	3
3	. 2	6	2158.0	575.0	4
3	2	7	2586.0	1227.0	5
3	2	8	2287.0	466.0	1
3	2	,	2438 0	1110.0	2
3	2	10	1711.0	627.0	8
4	2	1	1110 0	788.0	8
4	2	2	1593.0	466.0	9
4	2	3	2559.0	1182.0	5
4	2		1440.0	1029.0	6
4	2	5	1754 0	466.0	7
4	2	6	2262.0	1750.0	3
4	2	7	1750.0	680.0	4

-	BEST AV	AllARIE	CODY		
4	2	ar and the bala	1754 0	532 0	
4	2		1660 0	466.0	1
4	2	10	1673.0	600.0	2
5	2	1	2720.0	1026.0	2
5	2	2	1603.0	466.0	
5	2	3	27.04 0	1336 0	
5	2	-	2720 0	466.0	
5	2	5	2607 0	1366 0	6
5	2	6	2710 0	1193 0	7
5	2	7	2720 0	1090 0	3
5	2	8	2720 0	466 0	9
5	2	9	2720 0	978 0	
5	2	1.0	2642 0	466 0	
<u>.</u>	2	1	2720 0	1920.0	6
ы	2	2	2692 D	2134 0	7
ά	2	3.	2484 0	2309 0	
<u>.</u>	2	4	2538 0	2538.0	9
, i	2	5	2675 0	2398 0	10
<u>6</u>	2		2680.0	2331.0	1
6	2	- 7	2681.0	1593.0	2
<u>.</u>	2	8	2580.0	1754.0	
6		99	2274.0	1675.0	
<u>6</u>	2	10	2667 0	1410.0	
2	2		2237.0	1110.0	5
7	2	2	1850.0	1110.0	
7	2	3	2494.0	2196.0	
7	2	•	2076 0	1951 0	
7	2	5	2237 0	1400 0	
7	2		2398 0	2015 0	10

7	2	7	2577.0	1326.0	
7	2	8	2076.0	1900.0	7
7	2	9	1915.0	1469.0	3
7	2	10	2675.0	2080.0	
8	2	1	2720.0	2681.0	······································
8	. 2	2	2605.0	2582.0	5
8	2	3	2515.0	2515.0	1
8	2	4	2603.0	2603.0	2
8	2	5	2628.0	2628.0	8
8	2	6	2720.0	2720.0	9
. 8	2	7	2590.0	2455.0	10
9	2	8	2720.0	2621.0	6
8	2	9	2720.0	2565.0	7
8	2	10	2720.0	2424.0	3
9	2	1	2018.0	1639.0	3
9	2	2	2449.0	1465.0	
9	. 2	3	2459.0	2155.0	10
9	2	4 1 1 4	2398.0	2398.0	1
9	2	5	2238.0	1322.0	2
9 .	2	6	1810.0	1593.0	8
9	2		2462.0	1995.0	9
9	2	8	1838.0	1593.0	S
9	2	9	2346.0	1915.0	6
9	2	10	2215.0	1974.0	7
10	2	and the state of the	2641.0	1915.0	7
10	2	2	2587.0	2080.0	3
10	2	3	2665.0	2076.0	9
10	2	The Contraction	2627 0	2508.0	10

2213 0 2213 0 n -

RESPONSE TIME

RUN	CRAUP	SFAT	DETECTION	IDENTIFICATION	SUBJECT
	*				
1	1	1	16.2	20.0	1
1	1	2	13.5	34.8	2
1	1	3	12.6	18.1	3
1	1	4	10 6	18.2	4
1	1	5	11.1	16.3	5
1	1	6	12.3	38.8	6
1	1	?	10.1	24.3	7
1	• 1	8	10.4	27.0	8
1	1	9	10.4	12.3	9
1	1	10	11.1	18.3	10
2	1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	21.0	21.0	10
2	. 1	2	24.0	29.5	1
2	1	3	18 5	18.5	7
2	1	4	0.0	0.0	3
2	1	5	11.0	43.0	4
2	1	6	0.0	0.0	5
2	1	7	27.0	42.2	6
2	1	8	39.8	40 0	2
2	i	9	0.0	0.0	8
2	1	10	8.0	13.0	9
3	1	1	12.1	20.7	9
3	1	2	6.4	17.3	10
3	1	3	14.6	0.0	6



6	1	3	3	. 8	20.5	. 8
6	1	•	3	. 2	13.7	9
6	1	\$	3	. 3	6.0	10
6	1	6	3	. 1	65.0	1
6	1	,	20	. 1	20.9	2
6	1	Ą	7	. 6	17.8	3
6	1	9	5	. 7	33.8	4
6	1	10	5	. 3	27.3	5
7	1	1	4	. 4	18.7	5
7	1	2	9	Ð	44 4	6
. 7	1	3	34	. 1	34 . 1	2
7	1	4	7	. 8	48.1	8
7	1	5	30	2	39 1	9
7	1	6	+	. 6	7.8	10
7	1	,	•	. 2	29 5	1
7	1	8	24	2	61.5	7
7	. 1	,	. 4	6	37.5	3
7	1	10	4	8	20 0	4
8	1	1 .	3	2	37.6	4
8	1	2	4	2	11.0	5
8	1	3	2	7	44 . 2	1
8	1	4	36	6	40.0	2
8	1	5	4	. 2	31.8	8
8		6	3	. 3	23.8	,
3	1	7	1	5	73.6	10
9	1	8	5	0	40.2	6
8	. 1	9	3	. 7	54.9	. 7
9	1 21	10		.9	46 2	3

	1	1	5.6	11.5	3
9	1	2	1.3	6.2	
9	1	1	1.5	6.4	10
9	1	4	3.4	22 3	1
9	1	5	30.3	30.3	2
	1	6	2.4	17.2	8
9	1	1	2.7	12.8	9
9	1	8	7.2	18.8	5
9	1	9	5.1	28.4	6
9	1	10	6.7	17.0	.7
10	1	1	17.8	66.4	7
10	1	2	9.9	80.0	3
10	1	3	8.7	22.5	ė
10	1		1.8	7.8	10
10	1	5	6.9	56.2	
10	1	6.	0.0	0.0	2
10	1	7	5 2	18.1	8
10	1	8	26.0	26.0	4
10	1	ÿ	9.8	30.7	5
10	1	10	18.5	43.9	<u> </u>
	2	11	12.6	12.6	6
	1	2	5.7	17_9	
	22	3	10_2	22.9	
1	5.5		7.3	17.9	<u> </u>
	2	5	7.8	22.4	
	. 2		9.0	48.0	
	,	22	7 5	12 0	2
	2			9.4	3
<u> </u>	2	9	10.3	10.3	4

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

1	2	10	6.	6	39.	4	. 5
2	2	• 1	49	3	61 .	0	5
2	2	2	. 7	9	19.	5	6
2	2	3	7.	8	26 .	3	2
2	2	. 4	5.	6	27 .	7	8
2	2	5	7 .	3	19.	2	9
2	2	6	9.	7	13.	8	10
2	2	?	8.	4	10	2	1
2	2	8	. 8.	4	23	4	7
2	2	9	49.	2	49	2	3
. 2	2	10	9.	1	18.	3	4
3	2	1	6 .	0	6	0	4
3	2	2	8 .	7	9	.7	5
3	2	3	4.	2	26	9	1
3	2.	4	5	1	9	. 1	2
3	• 2	5	16.	2	26	2	8
3	. 2	6	5	0	27	0	9.
3	2	7	6	0	24	. 5	10
3	2	8	4.	0	24	0	6
3	2	9	4	5	16	4	7
3		10	9.	2	25	. 5	3
. 4	2		20.	6	20	. 6	3
4	2	2	9.	0	11	.2	4
4	2	3	16.	4	20	8	10
4	. 2		18.	4	18	•	1
4	2	5	18.	2	28	8	2
4	2		12.	7	48	2	8
4	2	7	11.	3	24	.7	9

	2	88	10.0	58.9	5
<u> </u>	2	9	4.5	5.5	6
4	2	. 10	5.7	11.0	7
5	2	1	2.9	8.5	
5	2	2	7.3	15.3	3
5	2	3	7.5	41 9	9
5	2		4.5	24 1	10
5	2	5	8.0	18.9	<u> </u>
5	2	6	8.9	28.9	2
5	2	7	8.7	38.6	8
5	2	8	2.0	13.0	4
5	2	<u>9</u>	4.4	18.7	5
5	2	10	6.6	6.6	6
ó	2	1	26.3	26.3	
6	2	2	36.7	41.7	2
6	2	3	20.9	28.1	3
ā	. 2	4	14.4	24.3	4
ó	2	5	23.4	26.9	5
6	2	<u>.</u>	10 5	25.0	66
6	2		7.4	16.7	7
6	2	8	22.1	36.5	8
<u> </u>	2	9	17.3	17.3	9
<u></u>	2	10	20.1	25 5	10
	2		18.4	28.4	1.0
	2	2	20_0	25.8	<u> </u>
	. 2	3	3 8	7.9	7
7	2			22 4	3
7	2		2.5	30.2	·····
	2	6	6.1	32.1	

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

7	2	1	10.9	10.9	6
7	2	8	15.4	15.4	2
,	2	9	18.0	22.0	8
7	2	10	17.7	27.4	9
8	2	1	5.4	6.8	9
8	2	2	12.2	42.6	10
9	2	3	4 4	24.8	6
8	2	•	4.2	7.7	7
8	2	5	8.0	44.6	3
8	2	ó	4.7	69.2	
9	2	7	6.4	14.4	5
8	2	8	21 3	51.2	1
8	2	9	3.3	39.8	2
8	2	10	14 3	47 3	8
9	2	1	13.4	20.4	6
9	2	2	5.5	17.5	9
9	• 2	3	2.3	17 3	5
9	2	4	1.0	16.0	6
9	2	5.	2.0	5.0	?
9	2	6	13.5	27.8	3
9	2	7	2 0	3.2	4
9	2	8	4.0	14.0	10
9	2	3	9.6	20.8	·····1
9	2	10	1.0	24.4	2
10	. 2	ť	17.8	17.8	2
10	2	2	12.1	18.0	8
10	. 2	3	2.0	15.2	4
10	2	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	11.2	53.2	5

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

10 2 6 1.0 9.0 10 2 7 16.7 16.7 10 2 8 9.2 10.8 10 2 9 12.0 20.8 10 2 10 14.7 14.7	10 2		24 1	71 4	
10 2 5 1.0 9.0 10 2 7 16.7 16.7 10 2 8 9.2 10.8 10 2 9 12.0 20.8 10 2 10 14.7 14.7	10 2				
	10 2	<u>•</u>	1.0	9.0	
	10 2	(16.7	16.7	
	10 2		9.2	10.8	
	10 2	<u> </u>	12.0	20.8	
	10 2	10	14.7	14.7	
					-
		•			
	R				-
	1				
			•		1.4
			-		
		2.	<u></u>		
					•