

AD-A282 672




Naval Command,  
Control and Ocean  
Surveillance Center RDT&E Division

San Diego, CA  
92152-5001

Technical Report 1647  
April 1994

# Surface Ship Infrared Signature Model Evaluation

C. P. McGrath  
D. R. Jensen  
P. P. Ostrowski



24P 94-23496



94 7 25 170

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

DTIC QUALITY ASSURANCE

**Technical Report 1647**  
**April 1994**

# **Surface Ship Infrared Signature Model Evaluation**

**C. P. McGrath**  
**D. R. Jensen**  
**P. P. Ostrowski**

**NAVAL COMMAND, CONTROL AND  
OCEAN SURVEILLANCE CENTER  
RDT&E DIVISION  
San Diego, California 92152-5001**

---

---

**K. E. EVANS, CAPT, USN**  
Commanding Officer

**R. T. SHEARER**  
Executive Director

**ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION**

Research for this topic was performed by the Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center (NCCOSC), RDT&E Division, San Diego, California, and the Naval Surface Warfare Center White Oak Detachment (NSWCWODET Code B42), Silver Spring, Maryland. Funding for this topic was provided through program element 0602435N, RL3C Project RO35T84/02, Task 2—Electro-Optical Systems Performance Assessment (EOSPA).

Released by  
R. A. Paulus, Head  
Tropospheric Branch

Under authority of  
J. H. Richter, Head  
Ocean and Atmospheric  
Sciences Division

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The authors thank Herb Hughes for his assistance in compiling this document; all those who participated in the August 1992 Research Vessel *Point Sur* field tests; especially, Kathleen Littfin for providing the air mass measurements needed to calculate the transmittance corrections and Keith Jones and Alf Cooper of the Naval Postgraduate School for providing the shipboard meteorology data.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### OBJECTIVE

This paper compares measured infrared data of the Research Vessel *Point Sur* (R/V *Pt. Sur*) with predictions from two ship temperature prediction codes. The prediction codes are the Ship Signature (SHIPSIG) model developed by Naval Surface Weapons Center, and the TCM2 model developed by Georgia Technical Research Institute (GTRI). TCM2 is the target model used in the Electro-Optical Tactical Decision Aid (EOTDA) that is being integrated into the Tactical Environmental Support System (TESS) and Tactical Aircraft Mission Planning System (TAMPS). SHIPSIG is a simplified computer model that is used for comparison.

### RESULTS

The R/V *Point Sur* was instrumented with surface-mounted thermistors and meteorological measurement equipment. Thermal images were collected with an airborne AGA-780 imaging radiometer installed in a Piper *Navajo* aircraft. The integrated ship temperature from each thermal image was adjusted to a zero-range value using the LOWTRAN 6 atmospheric prediction code to determine the path radiance and transmission effects. Attempts to relate the image temperatures to thermistor values showed inconsistent correlation, so only the AGA-780 image temperatures are presented here. The measurement uncertainty of the airborne AGA-780 system is less than two degrees Celsius. Both SHIPSIG and TCM2 compared favorably (within two degrees Celsius) with the measured values, regardless of viewing angle. The only exception occurred at sunset, where TCM2 over-predicted the ship temperature by four degrees.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

Both SHIPSIG and TCM2 produced good results with this limited data set. This test case was for a clear weather day. Further study should validate the model under more diverse weather conditions. The data indicate TCM2 may be over-predicting solar loading when the sun is low in the sky; however, this could simply be an anomaly of this data set. Further investigation should be performed with empirical data that are more accurate, such as from the AGEMA 900 imaging system (calibrated to within one-half degree) recently purchased by NRD.

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Date _____	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1
BACKGROUND .....	1
MEASUREMENTS .....	3
CALCULATIONS OF ZERO-RANGE AVERAGE SHIP'S TEMPERATURES .....	4
COMPARISON OF MEASURED AND MODELED SHIP'S TEMPERATURES .....	7
CONCLUSIONS .....	13
REFERENCES .....	15
GLOSSARY .....	17
<b>FIGURES</b>	
1. Position of the R/V <i>Point Sur</i> as a function of time after departing Monterey, California on 29 July 1992 .....	3
2. Calculated path radiances and transmittance as a function of time on 4 August 1992 .....	5
3. Average temperatures as measured by the AGEMA onboard the aircraft (upper) and their values corrected for atmospheric effects (lower) as a function of time for the port and starboard sides of the R/V <i>Point Sur</i> on 4 August 1992 .....	6
4. Heading of the R/V <i>Point Sur</i> and the sun's azimuth and zenith angle as functions of time on 3 and 4 August 1992 .....	7
5. Comparison of measured average ship's temperatures (port side) and those calculated by TCM2 for the time period 2000 to 2400 G.M.T. on 3 August 1992 for different viewing angles .....	8
6. Comparison of measured average ship's temperatures (port side) and those calculated by SHIPSIG for the time period 2000 to 2400 G.M.T. on 3 August 1992 for different viewing angles .....	9
7. Comparison of measured average ship's temperatures (starboard side) and those calculated by TCM2 for the time period 2000 to 2400 G.M.T. on 3 August 1992 for different viewing angles .....	9
8. Comparison of measured average ship's temperatures (starboard side) and those calculated by SHIPSIG for the time period 2000 to 2400 G.M.T. on 3 August 1992 for different viewing angles .....	10

9.	Comparison of measured average ship's temperatures (port side) and those calculated by TCM2 for the time period 0000 to 0300 G.M.T. on 4 August 1992 for different viewing angles .....	10
10.	Comparison of measured average ship's temperatures (port side) and those calculated by SHIPSIG for the time period 0000 to 0300 G.M.T. on 4 August 1992 for different viewing angles .....	11
11.	Comparison of measured average ship's temperatures (port side) and those calculated by TCM2 for the time period 0000 to 0300 G.M.T. on 4 August 1992 for different viewing angles .....	11
12.	Comparison of measured average ship's temperatures (starboard side) and those calculated by SHIPSIG for the time period 0000 to 0300 G.M.T. on 4 August 1992 for different viewing angles .....	12

# INTRODUCTION

## BACKGROUND

The Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences Division, Code 54, of the Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center RDT&E Division (NRaD) has developed computer codes for assessing the performance of airborne passive infrared surveillance systems operating against surface ships. One such code, the prediction of Performance and Range of Electro-Optical Systems (PREOS) presently resides in the U.S. Navy's Tactical Environmental Support System (TESS). The present version of PREOS addresses the ability of airborne Forward-Looking Infrared (FLIR) systems to perform range-dependent tasks, such as detection, classification, and identification of surface targets. The range at which a sensor can effectively perform depends upon the target's infrared radiance contrast with the naturally occurring background and the transmittance of the intervening atmosphere. The atmospheric transmittance diminishes the radiance contrast with range due to the effects of molecular absorption by the gaseous constituents and the absorption and scattering of suspended particulates (aerosols) and hydrometers (rain and snow). For a simple detection task, the maximum performance range is that range at which the target-background contrast is reduced by the transmittance to the minimum difference detectable by the sensor. The PREOS algorithm is presently based on a fixed temperature difference between a rectangular target and the sea background. This approach neglects (1) the effects of a wind-ruffled sea on the sky reflections, (2) emissions from the surface, and (3) the intervening atmospheric contributions to the total background radiance scene, which changes with viewing angle and altitude of the sensor. Also, without knowing the ship's actual temperature, which is dependent on its history (course, speed, and surrounding meteorological parameters), it is questionable that the detection range to an adversary target can ever be predicted with any assured degree of accuracy.

The PREOS code was recently updated (McGrath, 1992) to allow a ship commander, when aware of his ship's past and future courses, to use the prediction algorithm to determine the ranges at which an adversary can detect and track the ship using passive infrared sensors. These standoff ranges are of primary importance to estimate the times allowable for either evasive action against guided weaponry launched at the ship or for the deployment of countermeasures. For this application, the Ship Signature (SHIPSIG) computer code (Ostrowski & Wilson, 1985) developed at the Naval Surface Warfare Center is used to determine the ship's temperature history. SHIPSIG approximates the complex structure of a ship with plane vertical and horizontal elements that represent the ship's temperature at zero-range on an average basis. In the present model, the rectangular elements and ship stack correction factors apply to four large combatants (Ostrowski, 1993) and the R/V *Point Sur*. (The R/V *Point Sur* is a 135-ft research ship, owned by the National Science Foundation, that is operated for a consortium of Central California educational institutions, including the Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California.) The model requires as inputs: the ship's course and speed, as a function of time from a starting geographic latitude; the surface wind speed and direction; visibility; relative humidity; air temperature; the ship's initial temperature; cloud cover; and the viewing angle. The primary computational vehicle used in the updated PREOS, for calculating the aforementioned contributors to the sea background radiance, is a modified version (Wollenweber, 1988 & 1990) of the U.S. Air Force Atmospheric transmittance/radiance Code LOWTRAN 6 (Kneizys et al., 1983) that uses measured profiles of meteorological parameters as inputs. In this code, the sea surface

wave slopes are assumed to be Gaussian, distributed with variances in the upwind and cross-wind directions that are directly proportional to wind speed (Cox & Monk, 1954).

Solar glint, cloud emissions, and shadows contributing to the apparent radiance of the sea are not addressed in the PREOS radiance algorithm. PREOS will be replaced by the Mark III version of the U.S. Air Force Electro-Optical Tactical Decision Aid (EOTDA) (Freni et al., 1993), which will be incorporated into version 3.0 of TESS in FY 94. The Mark III EOTDA currently provides many sensor types and thermal models of several targets, including two ships (a frigate and a gunboat), and a variety of backgrounds. (The gunboat model is based on the characteristics of the R/V *Point Sur*.) The propagation environment is modeled as a simple two-layer atmosphere with explicit cloud contribution to down-welling radiance, but assumes a cloud free, line-of-sight from the target to the sensor. The thermal model used to compute target temperatures, Target Contrast Model #2 (TCM2) (Blackeslee & Rodriguez, 1992), treats the target as a distinctive three-dimensional network of nodes that exchange heat with one another and their environment.

TCM2 applies first-principles physics to the thermal interactions among interconnected three-dimensional nodes in a given atmosphere. SHIPSIG considers the target as a rectangular surface that interacts over time with the atmosphere. The TCM2 approach has the advantage of more accurately producing the target image. It also indicates hot and cold spots within the target area, which is useful at close ranges. Both SHIPSIG and TCM2 continuously track changes of ship's temperatures as headings change; however, as TCM2 is implemented in EOTDA, a constant ship's heading is assumed. Both models require knowing meteorological and navigational conditions several hours prior to the time of interest, so that the models can stabilize at a steady starting point. When this is not feasible, SHIPSIG uses ambient temperature as the starting target temperature, and TCM2 performs an integration, back in time from the known conditions, to initialize the model.

To date, the ship temperature models in the EOTDA and PREOS have not received adequate validation. It is the purpose of this report to utilize a set of airborne thermal images of the R/V *Point Sur* (obtained simultaneously with measurements of meteorological parameters) to calculate the zero-range, average ship temperatures for comparison with those predicted by the differing ship models.



## MEASUREMENTS

During July and August 1992, NRaD (Code 543) performed airborne temperature measurements of the R/V *Point Sur* off the coast of northern California using a calibrated 8- to 12- $\mu\text{m}$  thermal imaging system. The system was mounted in a Piper *Navajo* aircraft that was flown at low altitudes within the proximity of the ship. Stratus clouds were present throughout most of the cruise; however, the cloud cover abated after about 2000 Greenwich Mean Time (G.M.T.) on 3 August, and clear skies prevailed on 4 August. For this case study, these cloud-free portions of the data set have been selected for the ship temperature model comparisons.

Vertical profiles of meteorological parameters were obtained using a VAISALA, Model RS80, radiosonde system onboard the R/V *Point Sur*. When calibrated, the VAISALA measures pressure ( $\pm 0.5$  mb), temperature ( $\pm 0.2$  °C), and relative humidity ( $\pm 2\%$ ) as a function of altitude. The Naval Postgraduate School provided the meteorological data derived from the balloon launches onboard the R/V *Point Sur*. The times of these data sets coincided close to those of the radiance measurements. An NRaD computer code was used to convert the data to digitized profiles compatible for implementation to LOWTRAN.

Sea temperatures, surface wind data, and radon concentrations were also recorded onboard the R/V *Point Sur* throughout the measurement period. The radon concentration values were used to determine the type (continental or marine) of air mass present. Global Position Satellite (GPS) receivers were operated onboard the aircraft and the ship throughout the measurement period to obtain navigational data. This GPS reckoning of the two platforms, together with the aircraft altitude, allowed the viewing angle and slant range of the ship from the aircraft to be calculated. Although the ship maneuvered periodically on each day, its general heading, as a function of time after departing Monterey, California on 29 July, is shown in figure 1 for the period ending on 4 August 1992.




Figure 1. Position of the R/V *Point Sur* as a function of time after departing Monterey, California on 29 July 1992.

The thermal imaging system (AGEMA Model 780) had a 2.95-degree Field-Of-View (FOV) lens. The response of the system was determined by placing a blackbody of known temperature ( $\pm 0.1$  °C, for temperatures  $< 50$  °C) in front of the lens at the minimum focusing distance of 300 cm. The digitized video signal transfer function of the system then allowed the blackbody temperature to be reproduced to within  $\pm 0.2$  °C. The data processing software (CATS 2.00) of the AGEMA system allows the digitized image of the thermal scene to be displayed on a computer terminal. The resolved scene is represented across 128 pixels at 0.023 °C per pixel. The effective blackbody temperature corresponding to each pixel can be displayed by positioning a cursor at the appropriate position. The CATS software also allows the pixels, whose temperatures are either above or below a certain level, to be deleted from the thermal image. A temperature histogram of the remaining pixels, in a selected area of the image, can then be displayed. With this process, the average ship's temperature can be determined because the pixels that remain pertain to the radiance of the ship itself (independent of background).

### CALCULATIONS OF ZERO-RANGE AVERAGE SHIP'S TEMPERATURES

The average radiance measured by the AGEMA,  $N(R)_{meas}$ , at a range  $R$ , is the sum of the effective blackbody average radiance of the ship at zero-range,  $N(R = 0)_{ship}$ , and the atmospheric emission along the path  $N(R)_{path}$ ; for example,

$$N(R)_{meas} = N(R = 0)_{ship} \tau(R) + N(R)_{path} , \quad (1)$$

where  $\tau(R)$  is the atmospheric transmittance at the range  $R$ .  $N(R)_{meas}$  is obtained by converting the average temperature measured by the AGEMA to radiance using Planck's function integrated over the 8- to 12- $\mu\text{m}$  wavelength band. The atmospheric transmittance and radiance over the slant path is determined from a modified LOWTRAN 6 code employing the U.S. Navy Aerosol Model (NAM), as it appears in LOWTRAN 7 (Kneizys et al., 1988). The slant path is defined by the aircraft's altitude and the zenith angle of the target. Applying these values to Equation (1) solves for  $N(R = 0)_{ship}$ . Then  $N(R = 0)_{ship}$  must be converted to the average temperature of the ship at zero-range,  $T(ship)$ , using Planck's function.


To calculate the path transmittances and radiances, the LOWTRAN code requires the vertical profiles of pressure, temperature, and relative humidity. When operated with the Navy Aerosol Model (NAM), the current wind speed, the 24-hour averaged wind speeds, and the origin of the air mass are also required as inputs. If surface visibility is known, the LOWTRAN code allows it to be input, and it scales the aerosol model such that the visibility calculated at a wavelength of 0.55  $\mu\text{m}$  (using Koschmieder's equation) is the same as the observed value. If the visibility is not available, the code calculates a visibility from the unscaled distribution. Surface visibility was not recorded onboard the R/V *Point Sur*, so the calculated visibilities were used in the model evaluations.

The origin of the air mass was determined by the air mass factor (referred to as ICSTL in LOWTRAN 6) appearing in the first component of NAM. In the original version of LOWTRAN 6, ICSTL is related to the concentration of atmospheric radon,  $Rn$ , by the relation

$$ICSTL = INT(Rn/4) + 1 , \quad (2)$$



where  $R_n$  is the measured radon content expressed in  $\mu\text{Ci}/\text{m}^3$ , and INT refers to the closest integer value of  $(R_n/4)$ . In the original version of LOWTRAN 6, ICSTL is allowed to range between integer values of one, for open ocean conditions, and ten, for coastal regions. For the data set used here, measurements of radioactive radon were made onboard the R/V *Point Sur* using an Automatic Radon Counter (ARC-2A) (Littfin, 1992). The measured values of  $R_n$  caused the ICSTL index to exceed the previously defined upper limit of ten. This prompted an additional modification to LOWTRAN 6, to allow the use of non-integer values exceeding ten.

Examples of the path transmittances and radiances, calculated at the times of the AGEMA measurements on 4 August, are shown in figure 2. The variations with time between these two parameters are as to be expected; for example, an increase or decrease in transmittance results in a decrease or increase, respectively, in path radiance. It had been anticipated that temperature measurements using thermistors and a hand-held radiometer onboard the R/V *Point Sur* would allow the calculations to be validated; however, it was found that the "ground-truth" measurements by the different instruments at the same locations differed as much as one degree Celsius, and that these exact locations on the ship could not be identified on the AGEMA thermogram.



**Figure 2.** Calculated path radiances and transmittance as a function of time on 4 August 1992.


In figure 3, the upper plot shows the average ship's temperature as a function of time, for the port and starboard sides of the R/V *Point Sur*, as measured 4 August by the airborne AGEMA. The lower plot in figure 3 shows the same temperature values corrected for atmospheric effects. The corrected ship temperatures for all of the days (including the meteorological parameters, path transmittances, and radiances used in these calculations) have been reported in an earlier report (Hughes & McGrath, 1993).



**Figure 3.** Average temperatures, as measured by the AGEMA onboard the aircraft (upper) and their values corrected for atmospheric effects (lower) as a function of time for the port and starboard sides of the R/V *Point Sur* on 4 August 1992.

## COMPARISON OF MEASURED AND MODELED AVERAGE SHIP'S TEMPERATURES


The heading of the R/V *Point Sur*, with respect to the sun's azimuth and zenith angle, is illustrated in figure 4. On 3 August, the ship's heading was easterly (82 degrees true north) with the sun positioned off the starboard bow at 1900 hours G.M.T. Near 2000 hours, ship's heading was changed to 324 degrees, true north, placing the port quarter toward the sun. The ship remained on this heading for approximately one hour before returning to an easterly course (101 degrees, true north) at close to 2200 hours. Later, at 0030 hours (G.M.T) on 4 August (labeled as 24.5 hours, figure 4) the ship again changed course to a northwesterly heading (325 degrees, true north) placing the sun off the port bow. The ship remained on this heading for approximately 30 minutes before returning to an easterly course (111 degrees, true north), which placed the sun off the starboard quarter. Previously, during the first course heading on 3 August, the sun was high in the sky (zenith angle  $\approx 20$  degrees) as compared to its position during the second course change where the sun (zenith angle  $\approx 88$  degrees) was close to the horizon.




**Figure 4.** Heading of the R/V *Point Sur* and the sun's azimuth and zenith angle as functions of time on 3 and 4 August 1992.

Corresponding to these course changes are changes in the predicted ship temperatures. In the following figures, the calculated temperatures are presented for different viewing (depression) angles and are compared with the zero-range temperatures determined from the AGEMA


measurements. Figures 5, 7, 9, and 11 show the predicted ship temperatures calculated by the TCM2 model, and figures 6, 8, 10, and 12 show the SHIPSIG model. In figures 5 and 6, both models predicted rising temperatures when the port side of the ship was exposed to the sun. In figures 7 and 8, both models indicate decreasing temperatures on the shaded (starboard) side of the ship. The correspondence with the measured values is within two degrees, which is within the uncertainty of the measurements themselves. Figures 5 through 8 range from 1300 to 1700 hours (local time), and figures 9 through 12 range from near sunset at 1700 to 2000 hours (local time [0000 to 0300 G.M.T.]). In figure 9 it appears that the TCM2 model over-predicts the solar effect in when the sun is low in the sky. This may be the result of errors produced by the simplified three-layer transmission model employed by TCM2. The corresponding values calculated by the SHIPSIG model are shown in figure 10. The starboard calculations corresponding to the port view, figures 9 and 10, are shown in figures 11 and 12.



**Figure 5.** Comparison of measured average ship's temperatures (port side) and those calculated by TCM2 for the time period 2000 to 2400 G.M.T. on 3 August 1992 for different viewing angles.




**Figure 6.** Comparison of measured average ship's temperatures (port side) and those calculated by SHIPSIG for the time period 2000 to 2400 G.M.T. on 3 August 1992 for different viewing angles.




**Figure 7.** Comparison of measured average ship's temperatures (starboard side) and those calculated by SHIPSIG for the time period 2000 to 2400 G.M.T. on 3 August 1992 for different viewing angles.

**AVERAGE SHIP'S TEMPERATURES (STARBOARD) FOR DIFFERENT VIEWING ANGLES (3 AUG 1992)**



**Figure 8.** Comparison of measured average ship's temperatures (starboard side) and those calculated by TCM2 for the time period 2000 to 2400 G.M.T. on 3 August 1992 for different viewing angles.

**AVERAGE SHIP'S TEMPERATURES (PORT) FOR DIFFERENT VIEWING ANGLES (4 AUG 1992)**



**Figure 9.** Comparison of measured average ship's temperatures (port side) and those calculated by TCM2 for the time period 0000 to 0300 G.M.T. on 4 August 1992 for different viewing angles.



AVERAGE SHIP'S TEMPERATURES (PORT) FOR DIFFERENT VIEWING ANGLES (4 AUG 1992)




Figure 10. Comparison of measured average ship's temperatures (starboard side) and those calculated by SHIPSIG for the time period 0000 to 0300 G.M.T. on 4 August 1992 for different viewing angles.

AVERAGE SHIP'S TEMPERATURES (STARBOARD) FOR DIFFERENT VIEWING ANGLES (4 AUG 1992)




Figure 11. Comparison of measured average ship's temperatures (starboard side) and those calculated by TCM2 for the time period 0000 to 0300 G.M.T. on 4 August 1992 for different viewing angles.

AVERAGE SHIP'S TEMPERATURES (STARBOARD) FOR DIFFERENT VIEWING ANGLES (4 AUG 1992)




Figure 12. Comparison of measured average ship's temperatures (starboard side) and those calculated by SHIPSIG for the time period 0000 to 0300 G.M.T. on 4 August 1992 for different viewing angles.

## CONCLUSIONS

The temperatures calculated by both models are insensitive to the viewing angle in figures 5 through 12. While the inputs to both the TCM2 and SHIPSIG models are the same, their signatures in figures 5, 6, 7 and 8 differ in shape, but are within one to two degrees of each other. Both of the models respond equally to the solar insolation effects during the first time period on 3 August (high solar elevation angle), and the calculated temperatures agree well (within one degree Celsius) with the measurements. For the second time period on 4 August (low solar elevation angle), the TCM2 model predicted a peak in the average port side temperature, which is greater (approximately two degrees C) than the SHIPSIG value (figures 9 and 10). After the final change to an easterly course on that day, the TCM2 model also predicted a greater solar heating effect on the starboard side (approximately two degrees C) than did the SHIPSIG model (figures 11 and 12). In these instances, the SHIPSIG model is in better agreement with the measurements; however, the TCM2 calculations were made using the one-dimensional, intermediate grade model. The apparent TCM2 over-prediction of the target temperature at low solar elevation angles may be an anomaly of this data set, or may be caused by the degraded three-layer LOWTRAN code used in the TCM2 model. The TCM2 intermediate grade was used for this report because the intermediate grade is employed in the EOTDA Mark 3 that is to be included in TESS(3). These same comparisons need to be made with the TCM2 research grade model, and more exhaustive tests need to be performed with additional data sets.



## REFERENCES

- Blakeslee, L., and L.J. Rodriguez. 1992. "User's Manual for TCM2," Georgia Institute of Technology, interim report for period July–December under Contract F33615–88–1865 (January 1993), Wright–Patterson AFB, OH.
- Cox, C., and W. Munk. 1954. "Measurements of Roughness of the Sea Surface from Photographs of the Sun's Glitter," *Jour. Opt. Soc. of Am.*, 44: 838–850.
- Freni, J.M.L., C.N. Touart, M.J. Gouveia, D.A. DeBenedictis, I.M. Halberstam, D.J. Hamann, P.F. Hilton, D.B. Hodges, D.M. Hoppes, J.J. Oberlitz, M.S. Odle, C.N. Touart, and S–L Tung. 1993. "Electro–Optical Tactical Decision Aid (EOTDA) User's Manual, Version 3, Volume 11," Phillips Laboratory Technical Report PL–TR–93–2002 (II).
- Hughes, H.G., and C.P. McGrath. 1993. "Surface Ship Infrared Signatures Determined Using an Airborne Imaging System," Science and Technology Corporation Technical Report 2727, September.
- Kneizys, F.X., E.P. Shettle, W.O. Gallery, J.H. Chetwynd, Jr., J.H. Abreu, J.E.A. Selby, S.A. Clough, and R.W. Fenn. 1983. "Atmospheric Transmittance/Radiance: Computer Code LOWTRAN 6," Air Force Geophysical Laboratory Technical Report No. 83–0187.
- Kneizys, F.X., E.P. Shettle, L.W. Abreu, J.H. Chetwynd, Jr., G.P. Anderson, W.O. Gallery, J.E.A. Selby, and S.A. Clough. 1988. "User's Guide to LOWTRAN 7," Air Force Geophysical Laboratory Technical Report No. 88–0177.
- Littfin, K.M. 1992. "Technical Manual, Redesigned ARC–2A Automatic Radon Counter," NRaD Technical Report 2395 (September). San Diego, CA.
- McGrath, C.P. 1992. "PREOS Program for Determining Detection Ranges of Airborne FLIR Systems," NRaD Technical Report 1488 (January). San Diego, CA.
- Ostrowski, P.P. 1993. "A Simple Thermal Model for FLIR Detection Range Applications," meeting of IRIS Specialty Group on Targets, Backgrounds, and Discrimination, Vol II, pp 177–190 (July).
- Ostrowski, P.P., and D.M. Wilson. 1985. "A Simplified Computer Code for Predicting Ship Infrared Signatures," Naval Surface Warfare Center Technical Report 84–540.
- Wollenweber, F.G. 1988. "Infrared Sea Radiance Modeling Using LOWTRAN 6," Naval Ocean Systems Center Technical Document 1355, San Diego, CA.
- Wollenweber, F.G. 1990. "Impact of Atmospheric Layering on LOWTRAN 6 Radiance Calculations," *Appl. Opt.*, 29: 5177–5181.



## **GLOSSARY**

<b>ARC-2A</b>	<b>Automatic Radon Counter #2A</b>
<b>EOSPA</b>	<b>Electro-Optical Systems Performance Assessment</b>
<b>EOTDA</b>	<b>Electro-Optical Tactical Decision Aid</b>
<b>FLIR</b>	<b>Forward-Looking Infrared System</b>
<b>FOV</b>	<b>Field-of-view</b>
<b>G.M.T</b>	<b>Greenwich Mean Time</b>
<b>GPS</b>	<b>Global Positioning System</b>
<b>LOWTRAN</b>	<b>Low Transmission</b>
<b>NAM</b>	<b>Navy Aerosol Model</b>
<b>NRaD</b>	<b>Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center RDT&amp;E Division</b>
<b>NSWCWODET</b>	<b>Naval Surface Warfare Center White Oak Detachment</b>
<b>PREOS</b>	<b>Performance and Range of Electro-Optical System</b>
<b>SHIPSIG</b>	<b>Ship Signature</b>
<b>TCM2</b>	<b>Target Contract Model #2</b>
<b>TAMPS</b>	<b>Tactical Aircraft Mission Planning System</b>
<b>TESS</b>	<b>Tactical Environmental Support System</b>

# REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE <p style="text-align: center;">April 1994</p>		3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED <p style="text-align: center;">Final: Aug 1992</p>	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE <p style="text-align: center;">SURFACE SHIP INFRARED SIGNATURE MODEL EVALUATION</p>			5. FUNDING NUMBERS <p style="text-align: center;">PE: 0602435N PR: R035T84/02</p>		
6. AUTHOR(S) <p style="text-align: center;">C. P. McGrath, D. R. Jensen, P. P. Ostrowski</p>					
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center (NCCOSC), RDT&E Division San Diego, CA 92152-5001			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER <p style="text-align: center;">TR 1647</p>		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Office of Naval Research, Code 265250 800 North Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER		
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT <p style="text-align: center;">Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.</p>			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE		
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) <p>This report presents a case study comparison of two different models of SHIP infrared SIGNatures (SHIPSIG and TCM2) that are implemented into performance prediction codes for airborne, Forward-Looking Infrared (FLIR) systems. For this comparison, surface and vertical profile measurements of meteorological parameters were used with a modified version of the LOWTRAN 6 optical propagation code to remove the atmospheric effects on individual images of the Research Vessel <i>Point Sur</i> as recorded by an airborne AGEMA thermal imaging system. The average ship's temperatures determined at zero-range are then compared with those predicted by the two ship temperature models during clear sky conditions when the ship's heading changed to allow preferential heating of one side of the ship.</p>					
14. SUBJECT TERMS <p>electromagnetic propagation atmosphere</p>				15. NUMBER OF PAGES <p style="text-align: center;">25</p>	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT <p style="text-align: center;">UNCLASSIFIED</p>				16. PRICE CODE	
18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE <p style="text-align: center;">UNCLASSIFIED</p>		19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT <p style="text-align: center;">UNCLASSIFIED</p>		20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT <p style="text-align: center;">SAME AS REPORT</p>	



**UNCLASSIFIED**

21a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL C. P. McGrath	21b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (619) 553-1416	21c. OFFICE SYMBOL Code 543

## INITIAL DISTRIBUTION (U)

Code 0012	Patent Counsel	(1)
Code 0274B	Library	(2)
Code 1275	Archive/Stock	(6)
Code 50	H. O. Porter	(1)
Code 54	J. H. Richter	(1)
Code 543	R. A. Paulus	(1)
Code 543	C. P. McGrath	(50)

Defense Technical Information Center  
Alexandria, VA 22304-6145 (4)

NCCOSC Washington Liaison Office  
Washington, DC 20363-5100

Navy Acquisition, Research & Development  
Information Center (NARDIC)  
Arlington, VA 22244-5114

Center for Naval Analyses  
Alexandria, VA 22302-0268

GIDEP Operations Center  
Corona, CA 91718-8000