

R 813




Technical Report  
**R 813**



Sponsored by  
DIRECTOR OF NAVY LABORATORIES

June 1974

CIVIL ENGINEERING LABORATORY  
NAVAL CONSTRUCTION BATTALION CENTER  
Port Hueneme, CA 93043



STEREOSCOPIC MAPPING  
OF THE SEAFLOOR BY  
A TOWED TWO-FISH SIDE-  
SCAN SONAR SYSTEM

by R. D. Hitchcock

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

TA  
417  
1N3  
40 12817



Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER TR-813	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) STEREOSCOPIC MAPPING OF THE SEAFLOOR BY A TOWED TWO-FISH SIDE-SCAN SONAR SYSTEM		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED June 1973-June 1973 (2 weeks)
7. AUTHOR(s) R. D. Hitchcock		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS CIVIL ENGINEERING LABORATORY Naval Construction Battalion Center Port Hueneme, California 93043		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS ZF61-512-001-025
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Director of Navy Laboratories Washington, D. C. 20376		12. REPORT DATE June 1974
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		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)  Seafloor mapping, sonar mapping, seafloor map, contour map, stereo-sonar plot, digital computer plot, side-scan sonar, towed fish.		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)  Sea trials were conducted to test the concept of constructing a seafloor contour map by interfacing a manual stereo-sonar plotter with a digital computer. The at-sea work utilized a pair of 100-kHz, side-scan, sonar fish towed at a lateral separation of 42 feet. Real-time data on near-bottom scanning contained mutual interference effects which prevented the stereoscopic fusing of corresponding sonar images. System component  continued		

DD FORM 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE  
1 JAN 73

Unclassified  
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)



0 0301 0040398 6

## 20. Continued

errors were obtainable with repeated scannings of an artificial target array. Random errors in the horizontal component of the fish-pair vector,  $\vec{B}$ , were computed to be around 2.6 feet. Random errors in the vertical component of  $\vec{B}$  were around 7.5 feet. These errors were associated with an average off-bottom distance of 70 feet and a fish-pair lateral separation of 43 feet. Because of the marked sensitivity of target-elevation error to the horizontal and vertical errors in  $\vec{B}$ , the stereo plotting of seafloor contours could not yield useful results. It is concluded that measurement of the components of  $\vec{B}$  must yield errors less than 0.5 foot in 40 feet. It is further concluded that fish heave must be within 4 feet peak-to-peak and that mutual interference effects must be absent if stereo plotting of sonar-image pairs is to be performed successfully.

## CONTENTS

	page
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
THE STEREO-SONAR PROBLEM . . . . .	1
SEA TRIALS . . . . .	4
Sonar Equipment . . . . .	4
Tow System . . . . .	4
Stereo-Sonar Operations . . . . .	4
RESULTS OF SEA TRIALS . . . . .	7
DISCUSSION . . . . .	12
CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	13
RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	13
REFERENCES . . . . .	13
APPENDIXES	
A — Propagation of Measurement Errors . . . . .	14
B — FORTRAN Program for Least-Squares Analysis of Table 3 Data . . . . .	15
C — Proposed System for Analog Processing of Stereo-Sonar Signals . . . . .	19
NOMENCLATURE . . . . .	27



## INTRODUCTION

The concept of constructing a seafloor contour map by means of stereo-sonar imagery has been investigated by Mittleman and Malloy of the Civil Engineering Laboratory, Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California,<sup>a</sup> [1]. This investigation was mainly theoretical but included some qualitative results of scanning the seafloor with a pair of laterally separated, side-looking, sonar fish. Because of virtually no precision in the estimate of fish separation, it was not possible to compute relative target elevations. However, direct stereoscopic viewing of some of the sonar-image pairs did result in the blending of seafloor features into a three-dimensional illusion. From these results it was concluded that stereo-sonar techniques could be used for contour mapping of the seafloor in the same way that stereo-photo techniques are used to map land areas.

In June 1973, further sea trials were conducted by CEL in an attempt to study quantitatively the concept of stereo-sonar mapping. Two basic improvements in stereo-sonar technology were made for these sea trials: (1) a side-scan system was used having a sonar frequency lower by an order of magnitude than the frequency of the system used in the investigation of Reference 1; and (2) the lateral separation of the two sonar fish was doubled. Lowering the sonar frequency allowed coverage of a relatively large seafloor area, yielding, in turn, more data for a given operational period. It was assumed that increasing the lateral separation of the two sonar fish and towing at relatively short cable lengths would maintain a constant horizontal separation of the two fish; and, hence, target elevation errors would be less than 3 feet in 100 feet.

The June 1973 work described in this report was performed to produce sonar-image pairs which, not only would blend into a three-dimensional picture

when viewed stereoscopically, but also would allow digital computation of seafloor contour data by interfacing the computer with the settings made by the stereo operator.

## THE STEREO-SONAR PROBLEM

Stereo plotting to construct land contour maps from stereo-photo pairs is used because a human observer with his two eyes can pick out points of equal elevation with high precision. He can do this more efficiently than a machine and at lower cost. A machine subsystem can then be used to take the stereo observer's adjustments and produce numerical values for the contours.

A basic problem in side-looking stereo-sonar mapping is the requirement that the seafloor be scanned a line at a time, instead of an area at a time as in aerial stereo-photo mapping of land topography. This requirement imposes a severe restriction on the allowable magnitude of system errors because in the line-scanning system, information is obtained at a much slower rate than in the area-scanning system.

Another problem in stereo-sonar is that sonar measures range instead of angle as in optical imaging. Whereas the eye-brain system directly yields precise information on elevation differences if the image pair is obtained optically, in the stereo viewing of sonar image pairs, the eye-brain system yields false elevation differences. Hence, it becomes necessary to transform the false elevations to true elevations by using a set of equations. As outlined in Reference 2, this has been done for radar-stereo imagery. Side-looking airborne radar measures range in the same way that side-scan sonar does; that is, by measuring the travel time of the signal.

Further problems arise when an attempt is made to view stereo-sonar imagery in a stereoscope and to create a three-dimensional illusion. The result is

<sup>a</sup> Designation prior to January 1, 1974: Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory, Port Hueneme, California.

usually not a three-dimensional picture. This is due, in the case of large targets, high resolution, and near-bottom scanning, to different rates of parallax change<sup>b</sup> between shadow and target signals [3]. In the case of high-flying stereo-sonar scanning, where the essential imagery is contained in target returns, the three-dimensional illusion is created only if suitable contrast and resolution are present [1].

Figure 1 shows the geometry of the stereo-sonar system. The equations which take the echo ranges,  $R_1$  and  $R_2$ , to the relative target elevation are the following:

$$B = (h^2 + H^2)^{1/2} \quad (1)$$

$$\theta = \tan^{-1}(h/H) \quad (2)$$

$$\xi = \left\{ (R_2^2 - R_1^2)/2B \right\} - (B/2) \quad (3)$$

$$\eta = (R_1^2 - \xi^2)^{1/2} \quad (4)$$

$$y_t = -(\xi + B)\sin\theta + \eta\cos\theta \quad (5)$$

$$x_t = (\xi + B)\cos\theta + \eta\sin\theta \quad (6)$$

where  $B = |\vec{B}|$

$\vec{B}$  = fish-pair vector

$\theta$  = direction of  $\vec{B}$ , relative to horizontal (positive for fish no. 1 above fish no. 2)

$h$  = vertical component of  $\vec{B}$

$H$  = horizontal component of  $\vec{B}$

$y_t$  = vertical distance of target below fish no. 2 (positive for targets below fish no. 2)

The sixth equation yields,  $x_t$ , the horizontal distance of the target from fish no. 2. However, unless a shore-based fish navigation system is used, this computation is not important. Presumably, it is much easier to keep systematic fish-depth errors below a yard or so than it is to keep the systematic horizontal

errors (relative to shore or a fixed seafloor point) below several yards.

Figure 2 is a schematic diagram of a contour plotting system utilizing the principles of the double-projection, direct-viewing stereoplotter. In the stereo plotting of seafloor contours using side-scan data, the operator would begin somewhere on the crosstrack line passing through the first along-track point of the sonar-stereo scan. Labeling each recognizable target point on this first crosstrack line, the operator would move the viewing screen vertically and horizontally until the no. 1 target point appeared to lie in the plane of and at the center of the screen. His eye-brain system, with the aid of conventional stereo goggles (for example, red-green), would make this possible. Mechanical linkages between viewing screen and the computer would cause the sonar ranges,  $R_1$  and  $R_2$ , to be fed into the computer in feet. (Of course, with optical stereo images in front of the two projectors, no computer is necessary; and the operator simply makes a mark on the map surface directly below the center of the viewing screen.) With stereo-sonar images in front of the projectors, the computer would take  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  and, using Equations 1 through 6, calculate the target position.




Figure 1. Geometry of stereo-sonar system for computation of target position.

The problem with the procedure described above is that the operator would have to go through all of the target points on each crosstrack line, and then instruct the computer to arrange the

$$^b \text{Rate} = \frac{\text{Change in parallax (feet)}}{\text{Change in range (feet)}}$$






Figure 2. Schematic of double-projector direct-viewing stereo plotter.

target-position data into equal-elevation sets. Feeding these sets, successively, to an X-Y plotter would then yield the usual type of contour map. With optical stereo pairs in front of the projectors, this final sorting process is unnecessary because the operator directly plots equal-elevation points as he constructs the map.

The brute-force procedure is to directly measure  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  without using a stereo-projector/computer system (such as in Figure 2); but the assumption is, and has been from the beginning of this investigation, that the stereo-viewing approach will be faster and less expensive. This assumption is based on the reason used in stereo-photo plotting: it is easier to match corresponding target points by stereoscopic viewing than by (1) looking at the separate images, (2) picking out what appear to be matching points, and (3) making measurements directly on the image surface with a calibrated scale.

Hence, provided system errors are under a specified magnitude, the practical value of stereo-sonar contour mapping by stereoscopic viewing depends on how photographic we can make the images. The sonar-pair images must blend together in such a way that there is an insignificant probability of matching images which do not correspond. The image-definition problem is as important as the fish-vector measurement problem. Even with infinite precision in the measurement of  $\vec{B}$  and the fish positions in a shore-based reference frame, if the imagery cannot be fused into a three-dimensional illusion, stereo plotting is not workable.

## SEA TRIALS

### Sonar Equipment

The towed sonar system consisted of two side-looking sonar fish operated through a dual-channel transceiver/recorder having a wet-paper chart readout. Each sonar fish was a Klein Model 402A, shown in Figure 3 on board the towing vessel. The deck equipment was a Klein Model 401 recorder (Figure 4) and a specially built auxiliary unit for operating both fish simultaneously.

Each sonar fish was operated at 100 kHz and up to a maximum of 10 pps with pulse length of 0.1 msec. The two-fish system, including two 300-foot

electromechanical cables, was furnished under a lease agreement with Klein Associates, Inc., Salem, New Hampshire.

### Tow System

A schematic of the tow system is shown in Figure 5. A 42-foot, 2-inch-diameter steel pipe was attached to the stern of an LCM-8 and stabilized by lines connecting the ends of the pipe to the gunnels and the wheel house. The starboard section of this outrigger system is shown in Figure 6, with the fish under tow. Towing speed was held at approximately 2 knots.

The required tow-cable lengths were estimated for the desired depths and trailing distances of the two fish. The estimates were based on assumed values of hydrodynamic parameters, such as drag and cable buoyancy. The Klein electromechanical cable, having an outside diameter of 3/8 inch and utilizing a fiber glass strain member, was used for towing and signal transmission. After the required towing lengths were calculated, each cable was tied to the outrigger pipe as shown in Figure 6; and the excess cable was wrapped around a gunnel bitt and coiled on deck.

### Stereo-Sonar Operations

All of the stereo-sonar data were obtained at two near-shore areas. One area in the vicinity of CEL was about 2.5 nautical miles offshore with a depth of about 100 feet. The other area, just outside the surf zone at the Carpinteria beach about 22 nautical miles up the coast from CEL, had an average depth of about 25 feet.

Because the 100-foot-depth seafloor area near CEL is essentially featureless, an array of artificial sonar targets was implanted. Four reflectors were spaced about 500 feet apart, connected by a bottom-lying 1-inch-diameter wire rope. Each reflector was a 2,600-pound concrete block to which was attached a buoyant 35-inch-diameter aluminum sphere. A schematic of the array is shown in Figure 7.

The 100-foot-depth area was chosen to permit same-side stereo scanning with maximum bottom coverage. The tow-cable lengths were adjusted to produce the geometry shown approximately in Figure 8. Tow-cable lengths for fish no. 1 and no. 2 were adjusted to 80 and 20 feet, respectively, yielding depths of roughly 30 and 20 feet, respectively.




Figure 3. Side-scan fish with tow/signal cable.




Figure 4. Sonar transceiver/recorder.




Figure 5. Stereo-sonar tow system schematic.

Although the manufacturer's specifications state that the vertical sonar angle,  $\theta_s$ , is 20 degrees, it was assumed that in the 100 to 200-foot range adequate returns would be generated within a vertical angle of about 50 degrees.

To maximize stereo target-detection probability, the fish-vector  $\vec{B}$  was oriented toward the assumed target area (marked by surface floats as shown in Figure 7). This situation, of having  $\vec{B}$  slanted down instead of up (see Figure 8), creates a bad situation with respect to the precision of determining target elevation,  $y_t$ . If the target is on the line passing through the two fish (that is, on the extension of  $\vec{B}$ ), the theoretical random error in  $y_t$  becomes infinite. This is intuitively clear and is shown quantitatively by the error-propagation equations of Appendix A. It was believed, however, that the risk of having large errors in  $y_t$  was worth taking because of the small stereo target-detection probability associated with a slanted-up fish vector.

It was also suspected that a relatively large value of the elevation angle,  $\beta_1$  (see Figure 8) would decrease the one-fish target-detection probability because of the small shadow associated with a large  $\beta_1$ . A low- $\beta$  (low-flying) situation would cause large errors in  $y_t$ .

Hence, with all of the above considerations, the geometry of Figure 8 appeared to be optimum. A better geometry might have been opposite-side stereo (assuming that image blending is possible) with a horizontal  $\vec{B}$  component of around 200 feet. A




Figure 6. Starboard section of towing outrigger.




Figure 7. Schematic of artificial target array.

horizontal component of this extent was, however, not feasible. Analysis of outrigger statics and dynamics showed that a 42-foot length was the maximum tolerable.<sup>c</sup>

The other near-shore area, just beyond the surf, was chosen because of the abundance of prominent rock outcroppings. Although low-flying stereo scanning was required, with its attendant problems of grounding probability and error propagation, it was believed that the highly contrasted imagery would demonstrate the feasibility of fusing sonar charts into a three-dimensional illusion.

## RESULTS OF SEA TRIALS

The sea trials covered a period of 6 days, during which 15 hours were actually devoted to stereo scanning. Out of these 15 hours, about 3 hours yielded data which appeared to be usable in Equations 1 through 5. The data were those image points on the sonar charts which were recognizable as either the artificial targets, including the bottom-lying wire rope, or a rock outcropping.

<sup>c</sup> A sea test was conducted to see if a pair of manned small boats could be towed at a constant separation of 50 feet. With a tension line between the two boats, their separation could be held constant in a harbor tow; but, in the open sea, even small-wave action made it impossible to maintain a constant lateral separation.

<sup>d</sup> Long sections of the 1/2-inch wire rope are clearly discernible in the sonar charts. Because of the high resolution and contrast of the wire-rope imagery, three-dimensional blending is possible. However, the resolution of the sphere-block targets was not sufficient to yield three-dimensional imagery.




Figure 8. Geometry of same-side stereo scanning at 100-foot-depth site.

The remaining 10 hours of sonar scanning yielded imagery which did not contain clearly identifiable targets. Most of this data resulted from the existence of sea state 1 or greater during that time. From the sonar-chart readout and direct observation of outrigger and tow-cable motion during sea state 1 or greater, it was estimated that vertical motion of either one of the sonar fish was in excess of 4 feet, peak-to-peak. At the 100-foot-depth site, with approximate sea state 0, peak-to-peak vertical motion of an individual fish appeared to be under 4 feet, and imagery was produced in the sonar readout which could be blended into a three-dimensional illusion.<sup>d</sup> Figure 9 shows a section of stereo-sonar imagery of the 100-foot-depth target array for sea state 0.

Table 1 gives the results of 10 side-looking stereo sweeps at the 100-foot-depth site. The maximum possible number of measurements on a given sonar reflector is five. Crosstalk and mutual interference effects were minimized by using different tow-cable lengths and, thus, staggering the two fish out of each other's beam.


Table 1. Results of Stereo-Sonar Scans of 100-Foot-Depth Target Array

(Assumed value of horizontal stereo baseline, H, is 42.00 feet.)


Time	Target <sup>a</sup>	Fish No. 1 Echo Range, R <sub>1</sub> (ft)	Fish No. 2 Echo Range, R <sub>2</sub> (ft)	Fish Pair Depth Difference, h (ft) <sup>b</sup>	Computed Target Elevation, y <sub>t</sub> (ft)	Spread In Target Elevations, y <sub>t</sub> (ft)
0807	SB1	117.59	116.10	-19.17	105.88	9.80
0807	WR1	120.70	165.77	-19.16	95.53	9.77
0833	SB1	118.11	162.14	-21.75	115.68	
0833	WR1	121.73	165.77	-19.16	105.30	
0734	SB2	94.28	140.38	-19.69	70.77	12.09
0734	WR2	97.91	144.01	-19.69	72.67	24.92
0831	SB2	107.23	154.37	-19.68	65.19	
0831	WR2	112.93	158.51	-20.20	92.72	
0838	SB2	138.31	186.49	-18.13	72.95	
0838	WR2	142.97	189.60	-16.58	69.07	
0853	SB2	55.43	95.83	-23.83	77.28	
0853	WR2	62.16	101.01	-23.83	84.56	
0719	WR2	102.05	147.64	-18.13	67.80	
0829	SB3	110.86	158.00	-19.68	66.73	57.37
0829	WR3	113.96	160.59	-19.69	68.05	15.60
0648	SB3	146.60	194.26	-17.61	74.31	
0732	WR3	138.31	187.52	-21.24	83.65	
0720	SB3	88.06	126.91	-18.65	97.46	
0749	WR3	155.41	202.55	-18.65	81.71	
0839	SB3	143.49	191.67	-17.61	73.10	
0851	SB3	101.01	145.56	-29.01	124.10	
0750	SB4	117.07	163.69	-18.13	64.53	25.70
0750	WR4	123.81	170.95	-17.61	65.49	30.20
0827	SB4	125.36	171.98	-20.21	74.54	
0827	WR4	130.02	176.13	-19.69	89.45	
0842	SB4	121.22	165.77	-17.61	90.23	
0849	WR4	105.68	150.74	-20.73	95.69	
0849	SB4	99.98	145.56	-20.72	88.01	

<sup>a</sup> SB = sphere-block; WR = wire rope on bottom next to SB.<sup>b</sup> Average value: h = -19.85.

Distance,  $R_i$



Time



Distance between horizontal lines = 15 meters  
Time between vertical lines = 2 minutes

Figure 9. Two-fish sonar-chart readout of artificial target array.

In the next-to-last column of Table 1, the computed relative elevation,  $y_t$ , is given for every time the image appears. The parameter,  $h$ , of Equation 1 was calculated by taking the difference between the off-bottom heights of the two fish. This calculation, of course, assumes a flat bottom. The horizontal component of  $\vec{B}$  was assumed to be the outrigger length, 42 feet.

Table 1 reveals a marked scatter in the set of  $y_t$  values for any given target. For example, the target, SB3, has five computed values of  $y_t$ , and the difference between minimum and maximum  $y_t$  is 57.37 feet. The difference value,  $\Delta y_t$ , is given in the last column of Table 1 for each target. The smallest  $\Delta y_t$  is 9.77 feet.

Presumably, the large spread in  $y_t$  for a given target is the result of (1) errors in the measurement of the components of  $\vec{B}$ , and (2) target points lying on or near the line through the two fish. Systematic errors in  $h$  could be expected since this parameter had to be computed from off-bottom fish heights. Having target points on or near the extension of  $\vec{B}$  was evidently the result of "eyeballing" the LCM-8 course relative to the surface floats.

In an attempt to estimate the magnitude of average systematic and random errors in  $h$  and  $H$  during the 100-foot-depth scans, a least-squares computer analysis of the Table 1 data was made. A FORTRAN program (Appendix B) was written to determine the set,  $\{H_i, h_j\}$ , which minimizes the mean-square error,  $\epsilon$ , defined by

$$\epsilon = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\bar{y}_t - y_{ti})^2 \quad (7)$$

where  $N$  = number of times the target is scanned

$$\bar{y}_t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N y_{ti}$$

$$y_{ti} = y_t \text{ for } i^{\text{th}} \text{ computation}$$


The results are given in Table 2. The average value of  $h$  is -17.25 feet, compared to -19.85 feet as computed from off-bottom fish heights (Table 1). The average value of  $H$  is 43.06 feet, as compared to

the assumed value of 42.00 feet. Random error in  $h$  is 7.5 feet; random error in  $H$  is 2.6 feet. Relative vertical fish oscillations of this magnitude could be expected, as can be seen in Figure 9, and because of the sensitivity of fish depth to tow speed. However, a random error in  $H$  of almost 3 feet is surprising, since there is no hydrodynamic reason to expect this. At any rate, the computed systematic and random errors in  $h$  and  $H$  explain the pronounced spread in  $y_t$ . An example calculation in Appendix A shows that an 0.5-foot error in each of the four parameters,  $R_1$ ,  $R_2$ ,  $H$ , and  $h$  yields an error of 3 feet in  $y_t$  for a 100-foot depth.

Table 3 gives the results of the one-time sweep of the Carpinteria rock outcroppings. A single sweep was made of a stretch of outcroppings approximately 4,000 feet long, running roughly parallel to the beach. No attempt was made to repeat this sweep because of the high probability of grounding one or both fish. The values of  $y_t$  (Table 3) were obtained in the same way as for Table 1. Figure 10 is a section of the stereo-sonar imagery obtained at the Carpinteria site.

There is a smaller spread in the  $y_t$  values in Table 3 than one would expect from using the small elevation angle,  $\beta_1$ . Since nominal water depth along the towing track was about 25 feet, 80% of the  $y_t$  values of Table 3 are possible. As shown in Figure 11, a least-squares linear fit to the  $y_t$ -versus- $R_1$  data yields a line having a slope of 3.9 degrees, which is not more than 2 degrees greater than the actual seafloor slope. The intercept (Figure 11) is 17.7 feet, which, again, is consistent with the actual depth of 25 feet, since the two fish were about 5 feet under the surface.

The imagery of the Carpinteria seafloor is highly photographic for the fish nearest the target (upper chart, Figure 10). However, the imagery from fish no. 2 is degraded, and it is impossible to fuse the two charts into a three-dimensional illusion.<sup>e</sup> The degradation is apparently caused by the interference of the near fish (no. 1) with the beam of the far fish (no. 2). Staggering the two fish was not possible by the technique used in the 100-foot scannings. Towing the two fish at different distances would have increased the likelihood of grounding.



Distance between horizontal lines = 15 meters  
Time between vertical lines = 2 minutes

Figure 10. Two-fish sonar-chart readout of rock outcroppings.

<sup>e</sup> Stereoscopic viewing would require that one of the charts be observed via a mirror, or made into a transparency and viewed from behind.



Table 2. Results of Least-Squares Analysis of 100-Foot-Depth Data

Target	$H_i$ (ft) <sup>a, b</sup>	$h_j$ (ft) <sup>a, b</sup>
SB1	45.50	-30.00
WR1	42.00	-12.00
SB2	44.00	-17.50
WR2	45.00	-13.00
SB3	37.00	-30.00
WR3	45.00	-12.50
SB4	42.50	-12.00
WR4	43.50	-12.00

<sup>a</sup> Average values:  $\bar{H} = 43.06$  feet<sup>c</sup>  
 $\sigma_H = 2.57$  feet<sup>d</sup>  
 $\bar{h} = -17.25$  feet<sup>c</sup>  
 $\sigma_h = 7.53$  feet<sup>d</sup>

$$\bar{x} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i$$

<sup>b</sup>  $\{H_i, h_j\}$  is the set, consisting of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  value of H and the  $j^{\text{th}}$  value of h, which minimizes the mean-square error  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\bar{y}_t - y_{t_i})^2$ , where  $37.00 \leq H_i \leq 46.00$  and  $12.00 \leq |h_j| \leq 30.00$ .

$$\sigma_x^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\bar{x} - x_i)^2$$

<sup>d</sup> N = number of times target elevation is computed.

Table 3. Results of Stereo-Sonar Scan of Rock Outcroppings

(Assumed value of horizontal stereo baseline, H, is 42.00 feet.)

Time	Outcropping Target	Fish No. 1 Echo Range, R <sub>1</sub> (ft)	Fish No. 2 Echo Range, R <sub>2</sub> (ft)	Fish Pair Depth Difference, h (ft)	Computed Target Elevation, y <sub>t</sub> (ft)
1343	1	33.67	72.01	-2.59	24.21
1331	2	62.16	103.61	5.18	3.58
1331	3	102.57	141.94	5.18	27.31
1331	4	93.76	134.17	5.18	17.13
1331	5	53.36	88.58	4.66	28.34
1327	6	84.44	125.88	5.69	4.74
1342	7	65.79	109.30	0.00	0.00
1340	8	55.43	96.87	-1.55	15.74
1327	9	93.76	134.17	6.22	15.03
1325	10	44.03	85.48	6.73	0.26
1316	11	157.48	202.03	0.00	0.00




Figure 11. Plot of  $y_t$  versus  $R_1$  for rock outcroppings.

A minor problem with the imagery of Figure 10 is that the return signal to each fish was produced by the outgoing pulse from the near fish.<sup>f</sup> This was, presumably, the result of mutual interference.

## DISCUSSION

The results given in the preceding section clearly indicate that stereoscopic mapping of the seafloor from sonar data will require continuous and precise measurement of fish depths, separation, and lateral position in a fixed earth's reference frame. Because of the low rate of scanning the seafloor (the result of an energy propagation velocity of 5,000 ft/sec, compared to the velocity of light of 186,000 mi/sec), the only signal-processing approach to solving the slow-scan problem is some kind of automatic bridging process from one line scan to the next. This would only work for continuous targets extending throughout the swept area, for example, a long trench or cliff. Moreover, the circuitry needed for a bridging process of this sort would be more sophisticated than the circuitry and the acoustic transducers, combined, needed for measuring fish depth, fish separation, etc.

It is within the state-of-the-art to measure fish depths and fish separation with sufficient precision so that, with same-side stereo scanning, the relative target elevations are obtained with errors under 3 feet in 100 feet (see Appendix A). However, because of the likelihood of near- $\vec{B}$  points and the consequent large errors in  $y_t$ , it might be better to design a

<sup>f</sup> Computation of target range,  $R_2$ , requires the equation:

$$R_2 = 2 R_2' - R_1$$

where  $R_2'$  is the value read directly from the chart.

stereo-sonar system with a fish separation sufficiently large to allow opposite-side scanning. With continuous measurement of fish separation, the rigging and auxiliary structures for such a towing operation need not be too complicated. The idea of two manned catamarans connected by a crosstrack tension line might prove feasible. Large variations in separation distance during towing would be tolerable as long as the separation were precisely known for each line scan. The problem with opposite-side stereo scanning is, of course, that image correlation may be impossible for asymmetrical seafloor features, such as a cliff.

From the data obtained at the 100-foot-depth site the imagery problem can be avoided as long as fish heave, peak-to-peak, is less than 4 feet for echo ranges on the order of 100 feet. At greater depths, say 600 feet and more, as the result of greater tow-cable lengths vertical fish oscillations could be kept under 4 feet even in sea states higher than zero. Crosstalk or interference are no problem if tow distances are unequal; and, in low-flying sweeps in very shallow water (approximately 25 feet), controllable fins could be used to allow unequal trailing distances without danger of grounding.

Appendix C presents a description of a proposed analog signal-processing system which eliminates the need for interfacing a stereo operator's manipulations with a digital computer. The proposed system completely eliminates the need for fusing two sonar charts into a three-dimensional illusion; instead, the system produces in real time a readout equivalent to a stereo pair obtained photographically.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. In a zero sea state, towing the two sonar fish at an average depth of 17 feet and average speed of 2 knots caused a random error of about 2.6 feet in the 43-foot horizontal baseline. Random error in the relative vertical separation of the two fish was around 7.5 feet. Even though the magnitude of these errors was probably a function of the particular sonar fish used in the investigation plus the physical parameters of the tow cable, the outrigger, and the towing vessel, it is concluded that, in same-side stereo, the depth of each fish and the lateral separation of the two fish must be continuously measured with a precision of about 0.5 foot in 40 feet.

2. In same-side stereo scanning, 100-kHz sonar imagery will be suitable for fusing into a three-dimensional illusion if the two fish are towed out of each other's beam and the heave for an individual fish is under 4 feet, peak-to-peak, at off-bottom heights around 70 feet.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

An analog signal-processing system should be developed for producing an optical-stereo readout in real time from side-looking sonar returns. At-sea testing of this system should be conducted using a commercially available, side-scan system interfaced with conventional acoustic devices for continuously measuring fish depths and fish separation.

## REFERENCES

1. J. R. Mittleman and R. J. Malloy. "Stereo side-scan sonar imagery," in Proceedings of Seventh Annual Conference of Marine Technology Society, Washington, D.C., Aug. 16-18 1971, pp. 395-422.
2. M. M. Thompson, Ed. Manual of photogrammetry, 3rd ed., vol. II. Falls Church, Va., American Society of Photogrammetry, 1966, pp. 1030-1035.
3. Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory. Technical Report 787: Rotating acoustic stereo scanner for positioning loads onto the seafloor: Preliminary observations on an experimental model, by R. D. Hitchcock. Port Hueneme, Calif., April 1973.

## Appendix A

### PROPAGATION OF MEASUREMENT ERRORS

The random error,  $\sigma_{y_t}$ , in relative elevation,  $y_t$ , is computed from the equation:

$$\sigma_{y_t}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^4 \left( \frac{\partial y_t}{\partial \xi_i} \right)^2 \sigma_{\xi_i}^2 \quad (A-1)$$

where  $\xi_1 = R_1$

$\xi_2 = R_2$

$\xi_3 = H$

$\xi_4 = h$

From Equations 1 through 5 presented in the main text:

$$\frac{\partial y_t}{\partial R_1} = \frac{R_1}{B} \left[ \sin \theta + \left( \frac{B + \xi}{\eta} \right) \cos \theta \right]$$

$$\frac{\partial y_t}{\partial R_2} = - \frac{R_2}{B} \left( \sin \theta + \frac{\xi}{\eta} \cos \theta \right)$$

$$\frac{\partial y_t}{\partial H} = \frac{1}{B^2} (H \xi + \eta h) \left[ \sin \theta + \left( \frac{B + \xi}{\eta} \right) \cos \theta \right]$$

$$\frac{\partial y_t}{\partial h} = \frac{1}{B^2} (h \xi - \eta H) \left[ \sin \theta + \left( \frac{B + \xi}{\eta} \right) \cos \theta \right]$$

Example calculation:

Let  $R_1 = 83$  feet;  $\sigma_{R_1} = 0.5$  foot

$R_2 = 121$  feet;  $\sigma_{R_2} = 0.5$  foot

$H = 42$  feet;  $\sigma_H = 0.5$  foot

$h = 20$  feet;  $\sigma_h = 0.5$  foot

Therefore,  $\partial y_t / \partial R_1 = 3.76$

$\partial y_t / \partial R_2 = -3.58$

$\partial y_t / \partial H = 3.58$

$\partial y_t / \partial h = -1.18$

$$\sigma_{y_t} = \sqrt{(0.5)^2 \left\{ (3.76)^2 + (3.58)^2 + (3.58)^2 + (1.18)^2 \right\}} = 3.2 \text{ feet}$$

## Appendix B

## FORTRAN PROGRAM FOR LEAST-SQUARES ANALYSIS OF TABLE 3 DATA

```

DIMENSION R1SB(2),R2SB1(2),R1SB2(4),R2SB2(4),R1SB3(5),R2SB3(5),
R1SB4(4),R2SB4(4),R1WR1(2),R2WR1(2),R1WR2(5),R2WR2(5),R1WR3(3),
R2WR3(3),R1WR4(3),R2WR4(3),H(19),ETA1(19),ETA2(19),Y(5),AYT(19),I9,
119),HR(8),EE(8),E(19,19,19),LHN(8)
BF(A,B)=SQRT(A*A+B*B)
XIF(A,B,C)=((A*A-B*B)/(2.*C))-(C/2.)
ETAF(A,B)=SQRT(A*A-B*B)
YIF(A,B,C,D)=- (A+B)*SIN(C)+D*COS(C)
READ 1,R1SB1
READ 1,R2SB1
READ 2,R1SB2
READ 2,R2SB2
READ 3,R1SB3
READ 3,R2SB3
READ 2,R1SB4
READ 2,R2SB4
READ 1,R1WR1
READ 1,R2WR1
READ 3,R1WR2
READ 3,R2WR2
READ 4,R1WR3
READ 4,R2WR3
READ 4,R1WR4
READ 4,R2WR4
HU=37.0
ETA10=23.0
ETA20=2.0
RSC=51.802
DO 5 N=1,8
IF (N-1) 6,7,7
6 L1=2
GO TO 8
7 IF (N-2) 9,9,10
9 L1=4
GO TO 8
10 IF (N-3) 11,11,12
11 L1=5
GO TO 8
12 IF (N-4) 13,13,14
13 L1=4
GO TO 8
14 IF (N-5) 15,15,16
15 L1=2
GO TO 8

```

```

16 IF (N=6) 17,17,18
17 L1=5
   GC TO 8
18 L1=3
   8 CCN1IKUF
     DC 19 I=1,19
     AI=1
     H(I)=0.5*(AI-1.0)+HU
     DC 20 J=1,19
     AJ=J
     ETA1(J)=ETA10+0.5*(AJ-1.)
     DC 21 K=1,19
     AK=K
     ETA2(K)=ETA20+0.5*(AK-1.)
     HV=ETA2(K)-ETA1(J)
     B=BF(HV,H(I))
     A=ATAN(HV/H(I))
     AY=0.0
     DC 22 L=1,L1
     IF (N=1) 23,23,24
23 R1F=RSC*R1SE1(L)
   R2F=RSC*R2SE1(L)
   GC TO 25
24 IF (N=2) 26,26,27
26 R1F=RSC*R1SE2(L)
   R2F=RSC*R2SE2(L)
   GC TO 25
27 IF (N=3) 28,28,29
28 R1F=RSC*R1SE3(L)
   R2F=RSC*R2SE3(L)
   GC TO 25
29 IF (N=4) 30,30,31
30 R1F=RSC*R1SE4(L)
   R2F=RSC*R2SE4(L)
   GC TO 25
31 IF (N=5) 32,32,33
32 R1F=RSC*R1WH1(L)
   R2F=RSC*R2WH1(L)
   GC TO 25
33 IF (N=6) 34,34,35
34 R1F=RSC*R1WH2(L)
   R2F=RSC*R2WH2(L)
   GC TO 25
35 IF (N=7) 36,36,37
36 R1F=RSC*R1WH3(L)
   R2F=RSC*R2WH3(L)
   GC TO 25
37 R1F=RSC*R1WH4(L)
   R2F=RSC*R2WH4(L)
25 XI=XIF(R2F,R1F,B)
   IF (R1F-XI) 38,38,39

```

```

38 ETA=0.0
   XI=R1F
   GC TO 40
39 ETA=ETA F (R1F, XI)
40 YT=YTF (XI, B, A, ETA)
   Y(L)=YT+F1A2(K)
   AY=AY+Y(L)
22 CCNTINUE
   U=L1
   AYT(K, J, I)=AY/D
   ES=0.0
   DC 41 M=1, L1
   ES=ES+(AYT(K, J, I)-Y(M))**2
41 CCNTINUE
   E(K, J, I)=SGRT(ES/D)
21 CCNTINUE
20 CCNTINUE
19 CCNTINUE
   EMIN=999999.0
   DC 42 I=1, I1
   DC 43 J=1, J1
   DC 44 K=1, K1
   EMIN=AMINI(EMIN, E(K, J, I))
44 CCNTINUE
43 CCNTINUE
42 CCNTINUE
   EE(N)=EMIN
   I=1
45 J=1
46 K=1
47 IF(EE(N)-E(N, J, I)) 48, 49, 48
48 IF(K-19) 50, 51, 51
51 IF(J-19) 52, 53, 53
53 IF(I-19) 54, 55, 55
50 K=K+1
   GC TO 47
52 J=J+1
   GC TO 46
54 I=I+1
   GC TO 45
55 CCNTINUE
49 PRINT 56, ETA2(K), ETA1(J), H(I), AYT(K, J, I), EE(N)
   HN(N)=H(I)
   LFN(N)=ETA1(J)-ETA2(K)
5 CCNTINUE
   ALH=0.0
   AH=0.0
   AEE=0.0
   DC 57 N=1, 8

```

```

ALH=ALH+LHN(N)
AH=AH+HN(N)
AEE=AEE+EE(N)
57 CONTINUE
ALH=ALH/P.0
AH=AH/B.0
AEE=AEE/B.0
SLH=0.0
SH=0.0
SEE=0.0
DC 58 N=1.0
SLH=SLH+(ALH-LHN(N))**2
SH=SH+(AH-HN(N))**2
SEE=SEE+(AEE-EE(N))**2
58 CONTINUE
SLH=SQRT(SLH/P.0)
SH=SQRT(SH/B.0)
SEE=SQRT(SEE/B.0)
PRINT 59,ALH,SLH,AH,SH,AEE,SEE
1 FORMAT (2F8.2)
2 FORMAT (4F8.2)
3 FORMAT (5F8.2)
4 FORMAT (3F8.2)
56 FORMAT (3F14.2,2F14.4)
59 FORMAT (6F14.4)
END

```

2.27	2.28			
3.11	3.13			
1.82	2.07	2.67	1.97	
2.71	2.98	3.60	1.85	
2.83	1.70	2.14	2.77	1.95
3.75	2.45	3.05	3.70	2.61
2.26	2.42	2.34	1.93	
3.16	3.32	3.20	2.81	
2.33	2.35			
3.20	3.20			
1.97	1.89	2.18	2.76	1.20
2.85	2.78	3.06	3.66	1.95
2.67	3.00	2.20		
3.62	3.91	3.10		
2.35	2.51	2.04		
3.30	3.40	2.91		



## Appendix C

### PROPOSED SYSTEM FOR ANALOG PROCESSING OF STEREO-SONAR SIGNALS<sup>g</sup>

The proposed system utilizes echo signals from a pair of towed side-scan sonar fish to generate, in real time, a roll of photographic film which can be directly viewed in a stereoscope to produce a true three-dimensional illusion of seafloor topography. The parallax in the stereo-photo image pairs will be optically true; that is, the image pairs will be the same as those obtained with a photographic stereo-camera. The system will, thus, make it possible to produce a seafloor contour map by the same technique used in stereo mapping of land contours. No digital computer will be required as in seafloor mapping from direct stereo-viewing of sonar charts.

The proposed system is an analog computer that uses a thin-film photoconductive liquid-crystal sandwich to produce a series of luminous points corresponding to off-track seafloor points. This series of points is imaged by means of a 3-to-2-dimensional fiber-optic static-scanning system onto the stereo-photo film, resulting in pairs of stereoscopic traces of actual topography.

At a particular instant, the system images a pair of expanding, circular arcs onto the photoconductive liquid-crystal layered array. This array is capable of generating light only at the intersection point of the two arcs. The two circular arcs are initiated at the same instant that the two sonar pulses are initiated from the pair of towed fish. As the pulse from each fish moves out radially into the water, its wavefront has the shape of a circular arc; an optical image of each wavefront is reproduced within the system such that, at every instant, the radius of the optical image is proportional to the radius of the acoustic wavefront. Figure C-1 is a schematic of the system up to the liquid-crystal sandwich.

The system sequentially images certain intersection points of the two optically generated arcs onto a stereo-photo film. This imaging of the intersection points is the analog transformation of sonar signals to optical readout. This analog process computes the true target coordinates from the sonar parameters,  $R_1$ ,  $R_2$ , and  $B$  (Figure 1), just as

Equations 1 through 6 transform sonar to optical readout by means of a digital process.

The stereoscopic imaging process is performed by means of a static-scanning, fiber-optic assembly which maps each intersection point in the vertical plane of the sonar beam into a pair of stereo points on the crosstrack line in the plane of the photographic film. Figure C-2 is a schematic of the fiber-optics system.

The arc-intersection points imaged onto the photoconductive liquid-crystal sandwich represent the beginning of shadow regions along the crosstrack line. A given crosstrack line in a side-scan chart will contain blank or no-signal regions because of no energy being reflected from seafloor regions lying behind protuberances and outcroppings. These shadow regions produce negative derivatives in the echo signal. A circuit between the sonar transceiver and the optical-imaging system is responsive only to negative derivatives. Without this feature the system would image a multiplicity of arc-intersection points which would not be sensible on the photographic film.

The proposed system will work for any orientation of the fish-pair vector,  $\vec{B}$ . If the vector,  $\vec{B}$ , is continually changing in magnitude and direction during the tow, an additional device would be required to continually adjust the relative orientation of the arc-shaped slits. The successfulness of the proposed analog system, of course, depends on extremely high precision in the measurement of the tow-system parameters during each line scan.

<sup>g</sup> Invention Disclosure, Navy Case No. 57436 (patent application in preparation). The reader is referred to this Disclosure for a detailed narrative/pictorial description of the proposed system.




Figure C-1. Schematic of analog signal-processing up to Liquid Crystal Sandwich.




Figure C-2. Schematic of fiber-optics system.

## DISTRIBUTION LIST

SNDL Code	No. of Activities	Total Copies		
—	1	12	Defense Documentation Center	
—	1	1	Director of Navy Laboratories	
FKAIC	1	3	Naval Facilities Engineering Command	
FKNI	6	6	NAVFAC Engineering Field Divisions	
FKN5	9	9	Public Works Centers	
FA25	1	1	Public Works Center	
—	9	9	RDT&E Liaison Officers at NAVFAC Engineering Field Divisions and Construction Battalion Centers	
—	216	216	CEL Special Distribution List No. 11 for persons and activities interested in reports on Ocean Engineering	
<p><b>Bernard Willey (Code 385)*</b> Boston Naval Shipyard Boston, MA 02129</p>			<p>Public Works Officer Naval Security Group Activity Winter Harbor, ME 04693</p>	<p>Public Works Officer U. S. Naval Facility FPO New York 09552</p>
<p>LCDR David A. Cacchione, USN Office of Naval Research, BROFF 495 Summer Street Boston, MA 02210</p>			<p>Public Works Department Box 400 Naval Submarine Base, New London Groton, CT 06340</p>	<p>Staff Civil Engineer U. S. Naval Air Station Box 35-D FPO New York 09593</p>
<p>Commanding Officer (Code 200) Navy Public Works Center Naval Base Newport, RI 02840</p>			<p>LCDR T. A. Long, Jr., CEC, USN Naval Submarine Base, New London Groton, CT 06340</p>	<p>RDT&amp;E Liaison Officer Code 102 Northern Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command Philadelphia, PA 19112</p>
<p>President Naval War College Code 22 Newport, RI 02840</p>			<p>Commanding General U. S. Army Electronics Command Attn AMSEL-GG-TD Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703</p>	<p>Public Works Officer Naval Facility Lewes, DE 19958</p>
<p>Mr. S. Milligan SB 322 Naval Underwater Systems Center Newport, RI 02844</p>			<p>Engineering Director Code 092 Naval Ammunition Depot, Earle Colts Neck, NJ 07722</p>	<p>Mr. R. B. Allnutt Code 1706 Naval Ship Research &amp; Dev. Center Bethesda, MD 20034</p>
<p>Commander 21st Naval Construction Regiment Davisville, RI 02854</p>			<p>Plastics Technical Evaluation Center SMUPA-VP3 Piscataway Arsenal Dover, NJ 07801</p>	<p>Mr. M. A. Krenzke Code 172 - Submarine Division Naval Ship Research &amp; Dev. Center Bethesda, MD 20034</p>
<p>Commanding Officer CBC Technical Library Naval Construction Battalion Center Davisville, RI 02854 (2 copies)</p>			<p>Commanding Officer Amphibious Construction Battalion TWO FPO New York 09501</p>	<p>William F. Gerhold National Bureau of Standards Corrosion Section Washington, DC 20234</p>
<p>Library U. S. Army Cold Regions Research &amp; Eng. Lab. P. O. Box 282 Hanover, NH 03755</p>			<p>LT Ronald A. Milner, CEC, USN U. S. Naval Station Box 9 FPO New York 09540</p>	<p>A. Maillar Maritime Administration Office of Ship Construction Washington, DC 20235</p>

\* All addressees receive one copy unless otherwise indicated.

Chief of Engineers  
U. S. Army  
DAEN-MCE-D  
Washington, DC 20314

Benj. R. Petrie, Jr.  
Op-987 T8; Staff, Director RDT & E  
Room 4B514, Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20350

ENS James F. Morrow, CEC, USN  
Office of Comptroller of the Navy  
Navy Department  
Washington, DC 20350

Commander  
Naval Supply Systems Command  
Headquarters  
SUP 0423  
Washington, DC 20360

Technical Library, Ships 2052  
Naval Ship Systems Command  
National Center No. 3  
Washington, DC 20362

Commander  
Naval Ship Systems Command  
Code 00C  
Washington, DC 20362

Chief  
Bureau of Medicine & Surgery  
Research Department  
Navy Department  
Washington, DC 20372

U. S. Naval Oceanographic Office  
Library - Code 3600  
Washington, DC 20373

John DePalma  
U. S. Naval Oceanographic Office  
Code 9233  
Washington, DC 20373

Director  
Code 2627  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Washington, DC 20375

Mr. J. P. Walsh  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Code 8400  
Washington, DC 20375

Mr. J. J. Gennari  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Code 8410  
Washington, DC 20375

Director of Navy Laboratories  
Room 300, Crystal Plaza Bldg 5  
Department of the Navy  
Washington, DC 20376

Commanding Officer  
Chesapeake Division - Code 03  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
Washington Navy Yard  
Washington, DC 20390

CDR L. K. Donovan, CEC, USN  
Chesapeake Division  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
Washington Navy Yard  
Washington, DC 20390

Commandant  
Naval District Washington  
Public Works Department-Code 412  
Washington, DC 20390

Naval Security Engineering Facility  
Technical Library  
3801 Nebraska Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20390

Commandant (M-2/USP/83)  
U. S. Coast Guard  
400 SW 7th Street  
Washington, DC 20590

Commander  
Naval Ship Engineering Center  
Code 6136  
Prince Georges Center  
Hyattsville, MD 20782

Commander  
Naval Ship Engineering Center  
Code 6162  
Prince Georges Center  
Hyattsville, MD 20782

Technical Library  
Naval Ship Engineering Center  
622 Center Bldg  
Prince Georges Center  
Hyattsville, MD 20782

Mr. John B. Alfors  
Naval Ship Engineering Center  
Code 6101E  
Prince Georges Center  
Hyattsville, MD 20782

Chief, Marine & Earth Sciences Library  
National Oceanic & Atmospheric Admin.  
Dept of Commerce  
Rockville, MD 20852

M. E. Ringenbach  
Engineering Development Lab (C61)  
National Oceanic & Atmospheric Admin.  
National Ocean Survey  
Rockville, MD 20852

Mr. H. A. Perry  
Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak  
Silver Spring, MD 20910

LCDR Robert D. Smart, CEC, USN  
Naval System Engineering Dept  
U. S. Naval Academy  
Annapolis, MD 21402

Director  
Division of Engineering & Weapons  
U. S. Naval Academy  
Annapolis, MD 21402

Dr Neil T. Monney  
Naval Systems Engineering Dept  
U. S. Naval Academy  
Annapolis, MD 21402

Mr. D. H. Kallas  
Annapolis Laboratory  
Naval Ship Research & Dev. Center  
Annapolis, MD 21402

Library, Code 5642  
Annapolis Laboratory  
Naval Ship Research & Dev. Center  
Annapolis, MD 21402

Commanding Officer  
U. S. Army Mobility Equip. R&D Center  
Attn: SMEFB-HPC (Mr. Cevasco)  
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060

U.S. Army Coastal Eng. Research Center  
Kingman Building  
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060

U.S. Army Coastal Eng. Research Center  
R.A. Jachowski  
Kingman Building  
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060

Facilities Officer  
Code 108  
Office of Naval Research  
800 North Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217

LCDR G. E. Shank, CEC, USN  
Office of Naval Research  
Ocean Technology Program  
800 North Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217

Dr Nicholas Perrone  
Code 439  
Office of Naval Research  
800 North Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217

Dr Alexander Malahoff  
Code 463  
Office of Naval Research  
800 North Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22217

Oceanographer of the Navy  
Attn: Con N712  
200 Stovall Street  
Alexandria, VA 22332

CAPT Pharo A. Phelps, CEC, USN  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
200 Stovall Street  
Alexandria, VA 22332

Dr. Michael Yachnis  
Code 04B  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
200 Stovall Street  
Alexandria, VA 22332

CDR G.H. Gans, Jr., CEC, USN  
Code 042  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
200 Stovall Street  
Alexandria, VA 22332

Commander  
Code 0436B  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
200 Stovall Street  
Alexandria, VA 22332

CDR Walter J. Eager, CEC, USN  
Code PC-2  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
200 Stovall Street  
Alexandria, VA 22332

Mr. C. R. Odden  
Code PC-2  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
200 Stovall Street  
Alexandria, VA 22332

Commanding Officer  
Navy Public Works Center  
Norfolk, VA 23511

RT&E Liaison Officer  
Code 09P2  
Atlantic Division  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
Norfolk, VA 23511 (2 copies)

Staff Civil Engineer  
Commander Service Force  
U. S. Atlantic Fleet  
Norfolk, VA 23511

Director  
Amphibious Warfare Board  
Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek  
Norfolk, VA 23521

Commandant  
U.S. Army Logistics Management Center  
Attn: DLSIE  
Fort Lee, VA 23801

Public Works Officer  
Naval Hospital  
Camp Lejeune, NC 28542

RDT&E Liaison Officer  
Southern Division - Code 90  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
P. O. Box 10066  
Charleston, SC 29411

LCDR G. W. Callender, Jr., CEC, USN  
NROTC Unit  
Georgia Institute of Technology  
Atlanta, GA 30332

Public Works Officer  
Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory  
Panama City, FL 32401

Mr. R. E. Elliott  
Code 710  
Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory  
Panama City, FL 32401

Library Branch  
Army Eng. Waterways Experiment Station  
Vicksburg, MS 39180

Army Construction Eng. Research Lab.  
ATTN Library  
P.O. Box 4005  
Champaign, IL 61820

Commanding Officer - Eng. Div.  
MRD - Corps of Engineers  
Department of the Army  
P. O. Box 103, Downtown Station  
Omaha, NE 68101

Public Works Officer  
Naval Air Station, New Orleans  
Belle Chasse, LA 70037

Public Works Officer  
Naval Ammunition Depot  
McAlester, OK 74501

LT H. S. Stevenson, CEC, USN  
Texas A & M University  
Bryan, TX 77801

Dr. Arthur R. Laufer  
Office of Naval Research, BROFF  
1030 East Green Street  
Pasadena, CA 91106

Public Works Officer  
Marine Corps Base  
Camp Pendleton, CA 92055

Mr. H. R. Talkington  
Code 65  
Naval Undersea Center  
San Diego, CA 92132

Dr J. D. Stachiw  
Code 6505  
Naval Undersea Center  
San Diego, CA 92132

Mr. R. E. Jones  
Code 65402  
Naval Undersea Center  
San Diego, CA 92132

Technical Library  
Code 1311  
Naval Undersea Center  
San Diego, CA 92132

Director  
San Diego Branch  
Western Division  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
San Diego, CA 92132

Public Works Officer  
Code 75  
Naval Undersea Center  
San Diego CA 92132

Public Works Officer  
Naval Air Station  
North Island  
San Diego, CA 92135

Staff Civil Engineer  
Naval Station  
San Diego, CA 92136

Commanding Officer  
Navy Public Works Center  
Naval Base  
San Diego, CA 92136

Commanding Officer  
Naval Missile Center  
Code 5632.2, Technical Library  
Point Mugu, CA 93042

Office of Patent Counsel  
Code PC (Box 40)  
Naval Missile Center  
Point Mugu, CA 93042

Librarian, Code 9215  
Construction Equipment Department  
Naval Construction Battalion Center  
Port Huene, CA 93043

Commanding Officer  
Code 155  
Naval Construction Battalion Center  
Port Huene, CA 93043

Technical Library - Code C35  
Naval School  
Civil Engineer Corps Officers  
Bldg 44  
Port Huene, CA 93043

Commander  
31st Naval Construction Regiment  
Naval Construction Battalion Center  
Port Huene, CA 93043 (2 copies)

Commander (Code 753)  
Technical Library  
Naval Weapons Center  
China Lake, CA 93555

Superintendent  
Attn Library (Code 2124)  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, CA 93940

Dr Edward B. Thornton  
Department of Oceanography  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, CA 93940

Commanding Officer  
Western Division - Code 09PA  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
P. O. Box 727  
San Bruno, CA 94066

Commanding Officer  
Western Division - Code 04  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
P. O. Box 727  
San Bruno, CA 94066

Commanding Officer  
Western Division - Code 04B  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
P. O. Box 727  
San Bruno, CA 94066

Commanding Officer  
Western Division - Code 05  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
P. O. Box 727  
San Bruno, CA 94066

Commanding Officer  
Western Division - Code 20  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
P. O. Box 727  
San Bruno, CA 94066

Public Works Officer  
Naval Station  
Treasure Island  
San Francisco, CA 94130

Asst. Resident OIC of Construction  
Bldg 506  
Hunters Point Naval Shipyard  
San Francisco, CA 94135

Public Works Department (183)  
Naval Air Station  
Alameda, CA 94501

Supervisor of Salvage  
West Coast Representative  
4300 Eastshore Highway  
Emeryville, CA 94608

Director, Engineering Division  
Officer in Charge of Construction  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
Contracts, Southwest Pacific  
APO San Francisco 96528

Headquarters  
Kwajalein Missile Range  
Box 26, Attn SSC-RKL-C  
APO San Francisco 96555

Commanding Officer  
Mobile Construction Battalion TEN  
FPO San Francisco 96601

Operations Officer  
Naval Construction Battalions  
U. S. Pacific Fleet  
FPO San Francisco 96610

Commander  
Pacific Division  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
FPO San Francisco 96610

RDT&E Liaison Officer  
Pacific Division - Code 403  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
FPO San Francisco 96610

Mr. T. M. Ishibashi  
Navy Public Works Center  
Engineering Department - Code 200  
FPO San Francisco 96610

Public Works Officer  
U. S. Naval Station  
Box 15  
FPO San Francisco 96614

Mr. D. K. Moore  
Hawaii Laboratory  
Naval Undersea Center  
FPO San Francisco 96615

Officer in Charge of Construction  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
Contracts, Marianas  
FPO San Francisco 96630

LT G.D. Cullison, CEC, USN  
771 Murray Dr.  
Honolulu, HI 96818

Engineering Library, Code 202.5  
Puget Sound Naval Shipyard  
Bremerton, WA 98314

Commanding Officer  
U. S. Navy Public Works Center  
Box 13  
FPO Seattle 98762

Commanding Officer  
U.S. Naval Air Facility  
Box 15  
FPO Seattle 98767

Colleges, etc

Prof. W. E. Heronemus  
Civil Engineering Dept  
University of Massachusetts  
Amherst, MA 01002

MIT Libraries  
Technical Reports - Room 14 E-210  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Cambridge, MA 02139

Robert V. Whitman  
Room 1-253  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Cambridge, MA 02139

Mrs. A. P. Richards  
Biological Sciences  
William F. Clapp Labs - Battelle  
Washington Street  
Duxbury, MA 02332

Document Library L0-206  
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution  
Woods Hole, MA 02543

Pell Marine Science Library  
University of Rhode Island  
Narragansett Bay Campus  
Narragansett, RI 02882

Prof. R. W. Corell  
Mechanical Engineering Dept.  
Kingsbury Hall  
University of New Hampshire  
Durham, NH 03824

Kline Science Library  
Kline Biology Tower, Room C-8  
Yale University  
New Haven, CT 06520

M. Schupack  
Schupack Associates  
300 Broad Street  
Stamford, CT 06901

Mr. Willard J. Pierson, Jr.  
University Institute of Oceanography  
c/o The Bronx Community College  
West 181st Street and University Ave.  
Bronx, NY 10453

Reprint Custodian  
Dept. of Nautical Science  
U. S. Merchant Marine Academy  
Kings Point, NY 11024

Dept of Civil Engineering  
State University of New York  
At Buffalo  
Buffalo, NY 14214

Mr. R. F. Snyder  
Ordnance Research Laboratory  
Pennsylvania State University  
State College, PA 16801

Mr. William H. Gotski  
Pennsylvania State University  
212 Sackett Bldg  
University Park, PA 16802

Professor Adrian F. Richards  
Marine Geotechnical Laboratory  
Lehigh University  
Bethlehem, PA 18015

Associate Librarian  
Mart Science & Engineering Library  
Lehigh University  
15 E. Packer Avenue  
Bethlehem, PA 18015

Dr Hsuan Yeh  
Towne School of Civil & Mechanical Eng.  
University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Professor E. Chesson  
132 DuPont Hall  
Newark, DE 19711

Professor Raymond R. Fox  
Nuclear Defense Design Center  
School of Engineering & Applied Science  
The George Washington University  
Washington, DC 20006

T. W. Mermel  
4540 43rd Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20016

Library of Congress  
Science & Technology Division  
Washington, DC 20540

Research Library  
Chesapeake Bay Institute  
The Johns Hopkins University  
Macaulay Hall  
Baltimore, MD 21218

W. F. Searle, Jr.  
National Academy of Engineering  
808 Timber Branch Parkway  
Alexandria, VA 22302

Public Documents Department  
Wm. R. Perkins Library  
Duke University  
Durham, NC 27706

Dr Aleksandar S. Vesic  
Department of Civil Engineering  
Duke University  
Durham, NC 27706

Dr Bruce Muga  
Dept of Civil Engineering  
Duke University  
Durham, NC 27706

Dr Wm F. Brumund  
School of Civil Engineering  
Georgia Institute of Technology  
Atlanta, GA 30332

Professor J. P. Hartman  
Dept of Civil Eng. & Environ. Sciences  
Florida Technological University  
Orlando, FL 32816

Dr Charles E. Lane  
Institute of Marine Science  
University of Miami  
Coral Gables, FL 33146

Dr R. F. McAllister  
Professor of Oceanography  
Florida Atlantic University  
Boca Raton, FL 33432

C. R. Stephan  
Florida Atlantic University  
Department of Oceanography  
Boca Raton, FL 33432

Lorenz G. Straub Memorial Library  
St Anthony Falls Hydraulic Laboratory  
Mississippi River at 3rd Ave, SE  
Minneapolis, MN 55414

Dr R. C. Jordan  
Dept of Mechanical Engineering  
University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Library  
Portland Cement Association  
Research & Development Laboratories  
5420 Old Orchard Road  
Skokie, IL 60076

Dr N. M. Newmark  
1114 Civil Engineering Bldg  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, IL 61801

Professor W. J. Hall  
1108 Civil Engineering Bldg  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr M. T. Davisson  
2217 Civil Engineering Bldg  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, IL 61801

Metz Reference Room  
Civil Engineering Dept  
8106 Civil Engineering Bldg  
University of Illinois  
Urbana, IL 61801

Acquisition Dept - Serials Section  
University of Nebraska Libraries  
Lincoln, NE 68508

Robert D. Tent  
Undersea Services Division  
Fluor Ocean Services Inc  
P. O. Drawer 310  
Houma, LA 70360

Department of Oceanography  
Texas A & M University  
College Station, TX 77843

Civil Engineering Dept  
Texas A & M University  
College Station, TX 77843

R. C. Dehart  
Southwest Research Institute  
8500 Culebra Road  
San Antonio, TX 78228

Director  
Institute of Marine Science  
The University of Texas  
Port Aransas, TX 78373

Professor M. M. Ayoub  
Dept of IE  
Texas Technological University  
Lubbock, TX 79409

Dr Bernard C. Abbott  
Allan Hancock Foundation  
University of Southern California  
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Director  
Catalina Marine Science Center  
University of Southern California  
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Aerospace Corporation  
Acquisitions Group  
P. O. Box 92957  
Los Angeles, CA 90009

Dr Young C. Kim  
Dept of Civil Engineering  
Calif. State University, Los Angeles  
Los Angeles, CA 90032

TRW Systems  
Attn P. I. Dai R1/2178  
1 Space Park  
Redondo Beach, CA 90278

Mr. C. C. Mow  
The Rand Corporation  
1700 Main Street  
Santa Monica, CA 90401

Dr. Armas Laupa  
The Rand Corporation  
1700 Main Street  
Santa Monica, CA 90406

Robert Q. Palmer  
P.O. Box 7707  
Long Beach, CA 90807

Dr C. V. Chelapati  
Calif. State University, Long Beach  
Long Beach, CA 90840

Keck Reference Room (107-78)  
136 W. M. Keck Laboratory  
Calif. Institute of Technology  
Pasadena, CA 91109

Oceanic Library & Info. Center  
P. O. Box 2369  
La Jolla, CA 92037

Dr John F. Peel Brahtz  
P. O. Box 825  
La Jolla, CA 92037

Mr. F. Simpson  
Lockheed Ocean Laboratory  
3380 No. Harbor Blvd  
San Diego, CA 92101

Dr F. N. Spiess  
Marine Physical Laboratory of the  
Scripps Institution of Oceanography  
University of California  
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr Victor C. Anderson  
Marine Physical Laboratory of the  
Scripps Institution of Oceanography  
University of California  
San Diego, CA 92152

J. Padilla  
866 Concord Ave  
Ventura, CA 93003

Manager Ocean Systems, MVJG  
Lockheed Missiles & Space Co  
P. O. Box 504  
Sunnyvale, CA 94088

Engineering Library  
Stanford University Libraries  
Stanford, CA 94305

Mr. Richard G. Luthy  
615 Madison Street  
Albany, CA 94706

Dept of Naval Architecture  
College of Engineering  
University of California  
Berkeley, CA 94720

Engineering Library  
University of California  
Berkeley, CA 94720

Michael A. Taylor  
Civil Engineering Dept  
College of Engineering  
University of California, Davis  
Davis, CA 95616

Director  
Calif. Dept of Navigation & Ocean Dev.  
1416 9th Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Assoc. Professor R. A. Grace  
University of Hawaii  
Honolulu, HI 96822

School of Oceanography  
Oregon State University  
Corvallis, OR 97331

Dr S. R. Murphy  
University of Washington  
Seattle, WA 98195

Information Officer  
United Kingdom Scientific Mission  
British Embassy  
3100 Massachusetts Ave, NW  
Washington, DC

Mrs. Ragna Adolfsen, Librarian  
Cement- och Betonginstitutet  
Fack 100 44 Stockholm 70  
Sweden

Literature Exchange  
Cement and Concrete Association  
Wexham Springs  
SLOUGH SL3 6PL  
Bucks, England

#### Additions

LT J. M. Nelson, USN  
Hawaii Laboratory (Code 1591)  
Naval Undersea Center  
FPC San Francisco 96615

Mr. Austin Kovacs  
U.S. Army  
Cold Regions Research & Eng. Lab.  
P. O. Box 282  
Hanover, NH 03755

Mr. John Quirk  
Code 710  
Naval Coastal Systems Lab.  
Panama City, FL 32401

Public Works Dept.  
Puget Sound Naval Shipyard  
Bremerton, WA 98314

Mr. John R. Saroyan  
1320 Carl Avenue  
Vallejo, CA 94590

LCDR J. H. Osborn, CEC, USN  
Code PME-124  
Naval Electronic Systems Command  
Washington, D.C. 20360

Director  
Ocean Engineering Program Office  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
200 Stovall Street  
Alexandria, VA 22332

Mr. Edmund Spencer  
Ocean Engineering Program Office  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
200 Stovall Street  
Alexandria, VA 22332

Technical Library  
Naval Coastal Systems Laboratory  
Panama City, FL 32401

Mr. R. G. Bea  
Offshore Division—Construction  
Shell Oil Company  
P.O. Box 60124

LTJG W. M. Hall, CEC, USN  
Dept of Ocean Engineering  
University of Hawaii, Manolo Campus  
Honolulu, HA 96622

LCDR James W. Eckert, CEC, USN  
NROTC; NAU  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Cambridge, MA 02139

Commanding Officer  
Amphibious Const. Battalion 1  
San Diego, CA 92155  
Attn: Diving Officer



## NOMENCLATURE

$\vec{\mathbf{B}}$	Fish-pair vector
DS	Dynamic scattering (optical, in liquid crystal)
h	Vertical component of $\vec{\mathbf{B}}$
H	Horizontal component of $\vec{\mathbf{B}}$
N	Number of times target is scanned
OC	Outcropping
$R_1$	Echo range, fish no. 1
$R_2$	Echo range, fish no. 2
$R'_2$	Echo range, chart readout for OC data
SB	Sphere-block
t	Time
WR	Wire rope
$x_t$	Horizontal distance of target from fish no. 2
$y_t$	Vertical distance of target below fish no. 2
Z	Along-track distance
$\alpha$	Sonar depression angle
$\beta_i$	Fish elevation angle
$\epsilon$	Mean-square error
$\eta$	Value of $y_t$ for $\theta = 0$
$\theta$	Direction of $\vec{\mathbf{B}}$
$\theta_s$	Sonar beam angle, athwartship
$\xi$	Value of $x_t$ for $\theta = 0$
$\xi_i$	Stereo-sonar parameter
$\sigma$	Random error



Civil Engineering Laboratory  
STEREOSCOPIC MAPPING OF THE SEAFLOOR BY A  
TOWED TWO-FISH SIDE-SCAN SONAR SYSTEM, by  
R. D. Hitchcock

TR-813 27 p. illus June 1974 Unclassified  
1. Seafloor mapping 2. Sonar mapping I. ZF61-512-001-025

Sea trials were conducted to test the concept of constructing a seafloor contour map by interfacing a manual stereo-sonar plotter with a digital computer. The at-sea work utilized a pair of 100-kHz, side-scan, sonar fish towed at a lateral separation of 42 feet. Real-time data on near-bottom scanning contained mutual interference effects which prevented the stereoscopic fusing of corresponding sonar images. System component errors were obtainable with repeated scanings of an artificial target array. Random errors in the horizontal component of the fish-pair vector, **B**, were computed to be around 2.6 feet. Random errors in the vertical component of **B** were around 7.5 feet. These errors were associated with an average off-bottom distance of 70 feet and a fish-pair lateral separation of 43 feet. Because of the marked sensitivity of target-elevation error to the horizontal and vertical errors in **B**, the stereo plotting of seafloor contours could not yield useful results. It is concluded that measurement of the components of **B** must yield errors less than 0.5 foot in 40 feet. It is further concluded that fish heave must be within 4 feet peak-to-peak and that mutual interference effects must be absent if stereo plotting of sonar-image pairs is to be performed successfully.

Civil Engineering Laboratory  
STEREOSCOPIC MAPPING OF THE SEAFLOOR BY A  
TOWED TWO-FISH SIDE-SCAN SONAR SYSTEM, by  
R. D. Hitchcock

TR-813 27 p. illus June 1974 Unclassified  
1. Seafloor mapping 2. Sonar mapping I. ZF61-512-001-025

Sea trials were conducted to test the concept of constructing a seafloor contour map by interfacing a manual stereo-sonar plotter with a digital computer. The at-sea work utilized a pair of 100-kHz, side-scan, sonar fish towed at a lateral separation of 42 feet. Real-time data on near-bottom scanning contained mutual interference effects which prevented the stereoscopic fusing of corresponding sonar images. System component errors were obtainable with repeated scanings of an artificial target array. Random errors in the horizontal component of the fish-pair vector, **B**, were computed to be around 2.6 feet. Random errors in the vertical component of **B** were around 7.5 feet. These errors were associated with an average off-bottom distance of 70 feet and a fish-pair lateral separation of 43 feet. Because of the marked sensitivity of target-elevation error to the horizontal and vertical errors in **B**, the stereo plotting of seafloor contours could not yield useful results. It is concluded that measurement of the components of **B** must yield errors less than 0.5 foot in 40 feet. It is further concluded that fish heave must be within 4 feet peak-to-peak and that mutual interference effects must be absent if stereo plotting of sonar-image pairs is to be performed successfully.

Civil Engineering Laboratory  
STEREOSCOPIC MAPPING OF THE SEAFLOOR BY A  
TOWED TWO-FISH SIDE-SCAN SONAR SYSTEM, by  
R. D. Hitchcock

TR-813 27 p. illus June 1974 Unclassified  
1. Seafloor mapping 2. Sonar mapping I. ZF61-512-001-025

Sea trials were conducted to test the concept of constructing a seafloor contour map by interfacing a manual stereo-sonar plotter with a digital computer. The at-sea work utilized a pair of 100-kHz, side-scan, sonar fish towed at a lateral separation of 42 feet. Real-time data on near-bottom scanning contained mutual interference effects which prevented the stereoscopic fusing of corresponding sonar images. System component errors were obtainable with repeated scanings of an artificial target array. Random errors in the horizontal component of the fish-pair vector, **B**, were computed to be around 2.6 feet. Random errors in the vertical component of **B** were around 7.5 feet. These errors were associated with an average off-bottom distance of 70 feet and a fish-pair lateral separation of 43 feet. Because of the marked sensitivity of target-elevation error to the horizontal and vertical errors in **B**, the stereo plotting of seafloor contours could not yield useful results. It is concluded that measurement of the components of **B** must yield errors less than 0.5 foot in 40 feet. It is further concluded that fish heave must be within 4 feet peak-to-peak and that mutual interference effects must be absent if stereo plotting of sonar-image pairs is to be performed successfully.

Civil Engineering Laboratory  
STEREOSCOPIC MAPPING OF THE SEAFLOOR BY A  
TOWED TWO-FISH SIDE-SCAN SONAR SYSTEM, by  
R. D. Hitchcock

TR-813 27 p. illus June 1974 Unclassified  
1. Seafloor mapping 2. Sonar mapping I. ZF61-512-001-025

Sea trials were conducted to test the concept of constructing a seafloor contour map by interfacing a manual stereo-sonar plotter with a digital computer. The at-sea work utilized a pair of 100-kHz, side-scan, sonar fish towed at a lateral separation of 42 feet. Real-time data on near-bottom scanning contained mutual interference effects which prevented the stereoscopic fusing of corresponding sonar images. System component errors were obtainable with repeated scanings of an artificial target array. Random errors in the horizontal component of the fish-pair vector, **B**, were computed to be around 2.6 feet. Random errors in the vertical component of **B** were around 7.5 feet. These errors were associated with an average off-bottom distance of 70 feet and a fish-pair lateral separation of 43 feet. Because of the marked sensitivity of target-elevation error to the horizontal and vertical errors in **B**, the stereo plotting of seafloor contours could not yield useful results. It is concluded that measurement of the components of **B** must yield errors less than 0.5 foot in 40 feet. It is further concluded that fish heave must be within 4 feet peak-to-peak and that mutual interference effects must be absent if stereo plotting of sonar-image pairs is to be performed successfully.



<p>Civil Engineering Laboratory STEREOSCOPIC MAPPING OF THE SEAFLOOR BY A TOWED TWO-FISH SIDE-SCAN SONAR SYSTEM, by R. D. Hitchcock TR-813</p> <p>June 1974 27 p. illus</p> <p>1. Seafloor mapping</p> <p>2. Sonar mapping</p> <p>1. ZF61-512-001-025</p> <p>Unclassified</p> <p>Sea trials were conducted to test the concept of constructing a seafloor contour map by interfacing a manual stereo-sonar plotter with a digital computer. The at-sea work utilized a pair of 100-kHz, side-scan, sonar fish towed at a lateral separation of 42 feet. Real-time data on near-bottom scanning contained mutual interference effects which prevented the stereoscopic fusing of corresponding sonar images. System component errors were obtainable with repeated scanings of an artificial target array. Random errors in the horizontal component of the fish-pair vector, <b>B</b>, were computed to be around 2.6 feet. Random errors in the vertical component of <b>B</b> were around 7.5 feet. These errors were associated with an average off-bottom distance of 70 feet and a fish-pair lateral separation of 43 feet. Because of the marked sensitivity of target-elevation error to the horizontal and vertical errors in <b>B</b>, the stereo plotting of seafloor contours could not yield useful results. It is concluded that measurement of the components of <b>B</b> must yield errors less than 0.5 foot in 40 feet. It is further concluded that fish heave must be within 4 feet peak-to-peak and that mutual interference effects must be absent if stereo plotting of sonar-image pairs is to be performed successfully.</p>	<p>Civil Engineering Laboratory STEREOSCOPIC MAPPING OF THE SEAFLOOR BY A TOWED TWO-FISH SIDE-SCAN SONAR SYSTEM, by R. D. Hitchcock TR-813</p> <p>June 1974 27 p. illus</p> <p>1. Seafloor mapping</p> <p>2. Sonar mapping</p> <p>1. ZF61-512-001-025</p> <p>Unclassified</p> <p>Sea trials were conducted to test the concept of constructing a seafloor contour map by interfacing a manual stereo-sonar plotter with a digital computer. The at-sea work utilized a pair of 100-kHz, side-scan, sonar fish towed at a lateral separation of 42 feet. Real-time data on near-bottom scanning contained mutual interference effects which prevented the stereoscopic fusing of corresponding sonar images. System component errors were obtainable with repeated scanings of an artificial target array. Random errors in the horizontal component of the fish-pair vector, <b>B</b>, were computed to be around 2.6 feet. Random errors in the vertical component of <b>B</b> were around 7.5 feet. These errors were associated with an average off-bottom distance of 70 feet and a fish-pair lateral separation of 43 feet. Because of the marked sensitivity of target-elevation error to the horizontal and vertical errors in <b>B</b>, the stereo plotting of seafloor contours could not yield useful results. It is concluded that measurement of the components of <b>B</b> must yield errors less than 0.5 foot in 40 feet. It is further concluded that fish heave must be within 4 feet peak-to-peak and that mutual interference effects must be absent if stereo plotting of sonar-image pairs is to be performed successfully.</p>
<p>Civil Engineering Laboratory STEREOSCOPIC MAPPING OF THE SEAFLOOR BY A TOWED TWO-FISH SIDE-SCAN SONAR SYSTEM, by R. D. Hitchcock TR-813</p> <p>June 1974 27 p. illus</p> <p>1. Seafloor mapping</p> <p>2. Sonar mapping</p> <p>1. ZF61-512-001-025</p> <p>Unclassified</p> <p>Sea trials were conducted to test the concept of constructing a seafloor contour map by interfacing a manual stereo-sonar plotter with a digital computer. The at-sea work utilized a pair of 100-kHz, side-scan, sonar fish towed at a lateral separation of 42 feet. Real-time data on near-bottom scanning contained mutual interference effects which prevented the stereoscopic fusing of corresponding sonar images. System component errors were obtainable with repeated scanings of an artificial target array. Random errors in the horizontal component of the fish-pair vector, <b>B</b>, were computed to be around 2.6 feet. Random errors in the vertical component of <b>B</b> were around 7.5 feet. These errors were associated with an average off-bottom distance of 70 feet and a fish-pair lateral separation of 43 feet. Because of the marked sensitivity of target-elevation error to the horizontal and vertical errors in <b>B</b>, the stereo plotting of seafloor contours could not yield useful results. It is concluded that measurement of the components of <b>B</b> must yield errors less than 0.5 foot in 40 feet. It is further concluded that fish heave must be within 4 feet peak-to-peak and that mutual interference effects must be absent if stereo plotting of sonar-image pairs is to be performed successfully.</p>	<p>Civil Engineering Laboratory STEREOSCOPIC MAPPING OF THE SEAFLOOR BY A TOWED TWO-FISH SIDE-SCAN SONAR SYSTEM, by R. D. Hitchcock TR-813</p> <p>June 1974 27 p. illus</p> <p>1. Seafloor mapping</p> <p>2. Sonar mapping</p> <p>1. ZF61-512-001-025</p> <p>Unclassified</p> <p>Sea trials were conducted to test the concept of constructing a seafloor contour map by interfacing a manual stereo-sonar plotter with a digital computer. The at-sea work utilized a pair of 100-kHz, side-scan, sonar fish towed at a lateral separation of 42 feet. Real-time data on near-bottom scanning contained mutual interference effects which prevented the stereoscopic fusing of corresponding sonar images. System component errors were obtainable with repeated scanings of an artificial target array. Random errors in the horizontal component of the fish-pair vector, <b>B</b>, were computed to be around 2.6 feet. Random errors in the vertical component of <b>B</b> were around 7.5 feet. These errors were associated with an average off-bottom distance of 70 feet and a fish-pair lateral separation of 43 feet. Because of the marked sensitivity of target-elevation error to the horizontal and vertical errors in <b>B</b>, the stereo plotting of seafloor contours could not yield useful results. It is concluded that measurement of the components of <b>B</b> must yield errors less than 0.5 foot in 40 feet. It is further concluded that fish heave must be within 4 feet peak-to-peak and that mutual interference effects must be absent if stereo plotting of sonar-image pairs is to be performed successfully.</p>





