


**AD-A280 564**



**DOT/FAA/RD-93/40,1**

**Research and Development  
Service  
Washington, D.C. 20591**

**Synthetic Vision  
Technology Demonstration**



**Volume 1 of 4  
Executive Summary**

**Malcolm A. Burgess, FAA  
Terence Chang, TRW  
Dale E. Dunford, USAF  
Roger H. Hoh, Hoh Aeronautics  
Walter F. Home, GTRI  
Richard F. Tucker, TRW**

**DTIC  
ELECTE  
S F D  
JUN 24 1994**

**Synthetic Vision Program Office  
Federal Aviation Administration**

**December 1993**

**Final Report**

**DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2**

**94-19325**



*11218*

**This document is available to the public  
through the National Technical Information  
Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161.**

**This document has been approved  
for public release and sale; its  
distribution is unlimited.**



**U.S. Department  
of Transportation  
Federal Aviation  
Administration**



**U.S. Department  
of Defense**

**94 6 23 156**

**NOTICE**

**This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the U. S. Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The United States Government assumes no liability for the contents or use thereof.**

1. Report No. DOT/FAA/RD-93/40, I		2. Government Accession No.		3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle SYNTHETIC VISION TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (4 VOLUMES) Volume I - Executive Summary				5. Report Date DECEMBER 1993	
				6. Performing Organization Code ARD-100	
7. Author(s) M. Burgess, T. Chang, D. Dunford, R. Hoh, B. Hudson, W. Horne, R. Tucker				8. Performing Organization Report No.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address SYNTHETIC VISION PROGRAM OFFICE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION 800 Independence Avenue, S. W. Washington, DC 20591				10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)	
				11. Contract or Grant No.	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION 800 Independence Avenue, S.W. Washington, DC 20591				13. Type of Report and Period Covered FINAL REPORT	
				14. Sponsoring Agency Code ARD-1	
15. Supplementary Notes CO SPONSER: Control Systems Division USAF Wright Laboratory Wright-Patterson AFB, OHIO 45433-7521					
16. Abstract  <p>This report contains the description and results of a Synthetic Vision technology demonstration program conducted jointly by the Federal Aviation Administration, the Department of Defense and Industry. The relevant technologies including millimeter wave radar sensors, infrared sensors, head-up displays, and computer processing were developed and tested in static tower tests and in flight tests in which the weather conditions were carefully measured and documented. The purpose of the program was to evaluate and demonstrate the performance of the imaging sensors and of the complete imaging system during aircraft approaches and landings in low-visibility conditions.</p> <p>The static tower test facility used was the Avionics Tower Test Facility, located at Wright Patterson AFB, in which candidate sensors were set up at approximately 260 feet overlooking a nearby runway. The runway scene imaged by the sensors was instrumented to carefully measure the characteristics of fog, rain and snow as those conditions occurred in 1991-1992. Sensor performance and phenomenology was then fully characterized to provide a basis for further sensor development and for selection of sensors with which to proceed to flight test.</p> <p>The test aircraft used was a Gulfstream II configured with a comprehensive data collection system and instrumentation to permit measurement of fog and precipitation through which the aircraft was flown as well as system and pilot performance during those operations. Millimeter wave sensors and an infrared sensor were used to provide an electronic image of the runway on both head-up and head-down displays during approach, landing and takeoff. Test and demonstration flights were flown into 27 different airports in a wide variety of rain, fog and snow conditions during the period of May through December, 1992.</p>					
17. Key Words SYNTHETIC VISION FLIGHT TEST MMW RADAR			18. Distribution Statement Document of available to the public through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA 22161		
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified		20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified		21. No. of Pages 1-10	22. Price

## Table of Contents

Section	Title	Page
1.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Background .....	1
1.2	Objective .....	2
1.3	Technical Approach .....	3
1.4	Scope .....	5
2.	PROGRAM MANAGEMENT OVERVIEW .....	6
2.1	Management Approach .....	6
2.1.1	Federal Aviation Administration.....	6
2.1.2	Specialized Technical Experts .....	6
2.1.3	U.S. Air Force .....	8
2.1.4	U.S. Navy .....	9
2.1.5	Maryland Advanced Development Laboratory.....	9
2.1.6	Participating Industry Organizations.....	10
2.2	Schedule .....	13
2.2.1	Technology Survey .....	14
2.2.2	Estimated Demonstration System Performance Requirements.....	14
2.2.3	Sensor Development and Tower Testing .....	14
2.2.4	Experimental System Integration, Evaluation and Demonstration .....	16
2.2.5	Certification Issues Study Team .....	16
2.2.6	Harbor Vessel Detection Systems Requirements.....	17
2.3	Budget .....	17
3.	TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ELEMENTS .....	18
3.1	Technology Survey .....	18
3.1.1	Estimated Demonstration System Requirements .....	20
3.1.2	Technical and Systems Issues to be Resolved .....	20
3.2	Sensor Development .....	21
3.2.1	Demonstration Sensor System Guidelines for Bidders.....	21
3.2.2	Competitive Procurement.....	22
3.2.3	94 GHz Radar Fabrication.....	23
3.2.4	35 GHz Sensor Procurement and Fabrication.....	23
3.3	Sensor Tower Testing.....	26
3.3.1	Sensor Characteristics .....	30
3.3.1.1	MMW Radar Sensors .....	30
3.3.1.2	Infrared Sensors.....	31
2.3.2	Sensor Performance Measures .....	34
2.3.2.1	Performance Features.....	34
2.3.2.2	Phenomenology .....	35
3.3.3	Test Data Matrix For MMW Sensors.....	37
3.3.4	MMW Sensors Baseline Performance .....	39
3.3.5	MMW Radar Tower Test Results .....	42
3.3.6	Infrared Sensor Test Data Matrix.....	45
3.3.7	Infrared Sensor Baseline Performance.....	45
3.3.8	Infrared Sensor Performance in Fog, Snow and Rain.....	46
3.3.8	Conclusions Regarding SVS Sensor Tower Tests .....	48
3.3.8.1	MMW Sensors.....	48
3.3.8.2	Infrared Sensors.....	48
3.4	Experimental System Integration, Evaluation and Demonstration .....	59

3.4.1	Description of Experimental System.....	52
3.4.1.1	Sensors .....	53
3.4.1.1.1	Primary MMW Sensor .....	53
3.4.1.1.2	Backup MMW Sensor .....	54
3.4.1.1.3	3-5 Micron Forward Looking Infrared (FLIR) Sensor.....	55
3.4.1.2	Head up Display .....	56
3.4.1.3	Weather Sensors.....	58
3.4.1.4	SVS Test Aircraft.....	59
3.4.1.4.1	Part 91 Avionics.....	59
3.4.1.4.2	Special SVS Aircraft Features.....	62
3.4.1.5	Data Acquisition System.....	64
3.4.2	Description of Primary Test Airports.....	64
3.4.3	Ground-Based Simulation .....	64
3.4.4	Test Plan and Priorities .....	67
3.4.5	Evaluation Pilots .....	68
3.4.6	SVS Instrument Approach Procedures.....	69
3.4.7	Sensor Performance in Flight.....	71
3.4.7.1	Radar Sensor Performance Characteristics Measured in Flight.....	71
3.4.7.2	Summary of Radar Performance in Flight Tests.....	77
3.4.8	Image Quality Performance .....	80
3.4.8.1	Contrast .....	80
3.4.8.2	Variability and Sharpness.....	82
3.4.9	Pilot/System Performance .....	86
3.4.9.1	Experimental System (35 GHz MMW Sensor) Performance in Terms of Range and Altitude Where Pilot Called Runway Image .....	87
3.4.9.1.1	Variation Between and Within Pilots.....	87
3.4.9.1.2	Effect of Fog on Runway Image Call.....	87
3.4.9.1.3	Effect of Rain on Runway Image Call .....	88
3.4.9.1.4	Effect of Snow on Runway Image Call.....	88
3.4.10	Subjective Pilot Ratings .....	89
3.4.10.1	Pilot Rating of Workload in Simulated CAT IIIa and CAT IIIc Conditions .....	92
3.4.10.2	Pilot Rating of Workload in Actual CAT II and CAT IIIa Conditions.....	94
3.4.10.3	Summary Comments Regarding Pilot Performance and Workload Ratings.....	95
3.4.11	Summary of Pilot Commentary.....	95
3.5	Lessons Learned.....	98
4	Conclusions .....	103

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

## List of Illustration

Figure	Title	Page
1	Synthetic Vision Program Management Team .....	7
2	Experimental System Integration and Flight Test Team.....	12
3	Synthetic Vision Technology Demonstrator Program Schedule.....	15
4	Lear Astronics 94 GHz SVS Imaging Radar .....	24
5	Honeywell 35 GHz SVS Imaging Radar Components .....	25
6	Elevation Drawing of Test Area.....	26
7	Top View Drawing of Test Area.....	28
8	Synthetic Vision Sensor Tower Test Schedule .....	29
9	MMW Radar Detection of a Runway .....	30
10	IR Detection of a Runway.....	32
11	Kodak 3-5 Micron Sensor System Use In Tower Tests .....	33
12	Meteorological effects on MMW radar sensors.....	37
13a	MMW Test Data Matrix Sorted by Observed Weather .....	38
13b	MMW Test Data Matrix Sorted by Along-Path Visibility.....	38
14	MMW Sensor Resolution of Runway at 2 km Range.....	40
15a	35 GHz Downrange Power Profile.....	41
15b	95 GHz Downrange Power Profile.....	41
16	94 GHz Downrange Power Profile.....	42
17	MMW Sensor Performance at 2 km in Clear, Snow, and Fog.....	43
18	Flight Test Methodology .....	51
19	35 GHz Sensor Installation in Test Aircraft.....	54
20	94 GHz Sensor Installation in Test Aircraft.....	55
21	GEC Head-Up Display Installation in SVS Test Aircraft.....	57
22	Head-Up Display Symbology Used in SVS Test Aircraft .....	58
23	Precipitation Measurement Probe Mounted On SVS Test Aircraft .....	60
24	SVS Test Aircraft.....	61
25	Approach Procedures Used in Flight Test Program.....	70
26	Illustration of Radar Reflectivity.....	72
27	Illustration of Basic Radar Signature for Runway-Terrain Scenario .....	73
28	Illustration of Simple Gutter Plot with Basic Image Quality Metrics Indicated.....	74
29	RS 170 Video Contrast - August 18, 1992-2B (NTD at 2.5 km).....	83
30	RS 170 Video Contrast - August 18, 1992-2B (NTD at Pilot Confirms Rwy).....	83
31	RS 170 Video Contrast - August 18, 1992-2B (NTD at 200 ft AGL) .....	84
32	RS 170 Video Contrast - August 18, 1992-2B (NTD at 50 ft AGL ) .....	84
33	Cooper Harper Handling Quantities Rating (HQR) Scale .....	90
34	Modified Cooper Harper Workload Rating Scale (MCH).....	91
35	Frequency Distribution of Pilot Workload Rating Data for Simulated CAT IIIa and CAT IIIc Approaches .....	93
36	Frequency Distribution of Pilot Workload Rating Data for Actual CAT II and CAT IIIa Approaches.....	94

## List of Tables

<b>Tables</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
1	MMW Radar Sensors Tested At Tower.....	31
2	Characteristics of Camera Systems.....	33
3	Sensor Performance Features.....	35
4	MMW Phenomenology Features.....	36
5	MMW Radar Sensor Data Matrix.....	39
6	MMW Performance Summary at 2 km Range.....	45
7	IR Image Data Collected at WPAFB 03/13/92 Through 05/28/92.....	46
8	IR Image Data Analyzed.....	46
9	Aircraft Avionics.....	59
10	Description of Primary Test Airports.....	65
11	Summary of Project Objectives and Accomplishments.....	67
12	Selected Radar Characteristics Important for Synthetic Vision.....	76
13	Summary of Contrast Metric Correlation to Runway Detection.....	85
14	Performance Standards.....	92

## PREFACE

The Synthetic Vision Technology Demonstration Program was somewhat unique when organized in 1988 in that it was undertaken as a joint effort between several government agencies and many different organizations within the aviation industry. While the participating government agencies provided the monies that actually changed hands, and many of the engineering support activities were defined through contractual arrangements between the participating parties, major contributions were made by the sensor manufacturers and by the U.S. Air Force in the form of equipment, hardware and software development, and technical support. The Program clearly enjoyed the interest and support of many organizations within the aviation community.

This final report of the Technology Demonstration Program is but one of many forms of communication used to document the lessons learned and conclusions reached in the course of the four year effort. A number of papers were written and presented by participants during the Program in many technical forums throughout the industry. Those written by the sensor manufacturers describing their respective designs are of particular interest. The proceedings of the eight technical symposiums hosted by the program participants in support of the voluntary synthetic vision systems certification issues study effort are also a valuable source of information regarding all aspects of the Synthetic Vision concept and its implementation. The digital and video data collected in the course of this Technology Demonstration Program is to be archived in a form and format providing easy access for those interested in further analyses of the data. There is also an extensive Program documentation file that may be of interest to some. Requests for the archived data should be directed to the manager of the FAA System Technology Division, FAA/ ARD-100, at the FAA Headquarters in Washington, D.C.

This final report is a compilation of information provided by the many participants in the Technology Demonstration. Volume 1 of this four volume report is an Executive Summary containing an overview of the work from a management perspective. Volume 2, which documents the Sensor Tower Tests performed in the Program, is largely the work of Georgia Tech Research Institute who was enlisted to provide an independent assessment of the performance of the sensors. Volume 3 documents the Flight Tests performed in the program, incorporating reports from all of the participants including TRW, Georgia Tech Research Institute, the sensor and display manufacturers, the technical consultants to the program, and the Program Office. Volume 4 is a compilation of appendixes containing additional detail pertaining to the Flight Tests.

In the interest of keeping the list manageable, the names included as the authors on the title pages of this final report of the Synthetic Vision Technology Demonstration are those of the principal contributors to the writing of the report. A few of the principal participants in the work performed have also been recognized briefly in the front of each volume of the report. There were, however, some 75 individuals whose expertise, interest and dedication were absolutely

**essential to the success of this Demonstration. Each individual's contributions were unique; without them the Demonstration could not have been accomplished.**

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 BACKGROUND

In 1988 the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), in cooperation with industry, the United States Air Force (USAF), the Navy, and several other government organizations initiated an effort to demonstrate the capabilities of existing technologies to provide an image of the runway and surrounding environment for pilots operating aircraft in low visibility conditions. This effort was named the Synthetic Vision Technology Demonstration (SVTD) program. Its goal was to document and demonstrate aircraft sensor and system performance achieved with pilots using millimeter wave (MMW) radar sensors, a forward-looking infrared (FLIR) sensor, and a head-up display (HUD).

There are several "windows" in the electromagnetic frequency spectrum where molecular absorption due to water vapor and other gases is lowest. One such region is the visible portion of the spectrum which we know from our visual experience. Other minimum absorption regions occur in the infrared and MMW regions. When the effects of water drops are added, such as rain and fog, then the higher frequency-short wavelength portions of the spectrum are much less useful. Two frequencies in the MMW portion of the spectrum - 35 and 94 GHz - appear to offer significant promise for the synthetic vision application and thus radar sensors operating at these frequencies were investigated under the program. A platinum silicide 3-5 micron infrared camera was also investigated.

The Synthetic Vision System concept offers the potential for safer, more widely available and cost-effective instrument approaches in low ceiling/visibility conditions. Autoland systems providing landing guidance in Category III conditions are very expensive to procure, operate and maintain because of the stringent requirements for reliability and redundancy. Ground equipment and support for Type 3 ILS (Instrument Landing System) airports is so expensive that only a few United States airports are so equipped. In using the autoland systems, the pilot must scan the instrument panel with only the ILS guidance indications available to monitor course and glideslope progress. Synthetic Vision would provide the aircrew a redundant and independent source of data to monitor progress during an instrument guided approach. In the vast majority of low visibility operations today, the aircrew fly the approach to a minimum altitude consistent with the capabilities of the instrument landing system on the ground and with their level of equipment and training in the cockpit at which point they must then bring the outside references as well as the information on their instrument panel into view and accomplish a manual landing. The pilot must transition from the instrument panel scan alone to the outside view very late in the

approach, with seconds to touchdown, and during a high workload phase of flight. This transition from "head down" to "head up" would be avoided if the pilot could already "see" the runway and flight data on a headup display throughout the approach, in spite of fog and precipitation.

The concept of using millimeter-wave sensors for low visibility aircraft operations is not new. In the late 1960's, an imaging 33 GHz radar designed by Texas Instruments was flight tested on a Convair 240 aircraft with the image generated on a head-down cathode ray tube display. The weather penetration capability of the radar was demonstrated in fog, snow, and light rain. Swissair conducted flight tests with a different configuration of the TI system in the early 1970's. It was later installed by the Air Force Flight Dynamics Directorate on a C-135 aircraft with a five foot antenna for flight evaluation. The Air Force flew 1,619 approaches in a wide variety of weather-conditions, including heavy snow and heavy rain, further validating the weather penetration capability of the millimeter-wave radar.

In the early 1980's, Federal Express Corporation pioneered the development of the HUD as the display device to be used with an imaging, weather penetrating sensor. Considerable effort and investment led to the certification of a HUD for commercial aviation use. However, the risk and estimated additional cost of further development, to include a weather penetrating sensor, and to achieve certification was so high that Federal Express chose not to continue.

A significant subset of the Synthetic Vision concept has already been certified for commercial use. Today, Alaska Airlines is flying manual Category 3a approaches to Type 2 and 3 airports with a 50 foot decision height and 700 RVR (Runway Visual Range), via a combination of an inertially based Flight Dynamics Inc. head-up guidance system (HGS), and ILS equipment. The system does not include a weather penetrating sensor, but does allow the pilot to maintain an outside scan, and greatly enhances the precision of manually flown approaches.

While these previous efforts to develop and flight test millimeter-wave sensors strongly suggest that a low-visibility imaging landing system is feasible, insufficient engineering data needed to predict system performance and support the design of an operational installation was produced.

## **1.2. OBJECTIVE**

The objective of the Synthetic Vision Technology Demonstration program was to develop, demonstrate, and document the performance of a low-visibility, visual-imaging aircraft

landing system. The experimental Synthetic Vision System components included on-board imaging sensor systems using millimeter-wave and infrared technology to penetrate fog, and both head-up (HUD) and head-down (HDD) displays. The displays presented the processed raster image of the forward scene, combined with suitable avionics-based stroke symbology for the pilot's use during a manually flown approach and landing. The experimental system, sometimes referred to as a functional prototype system, included all the functions (in prototype form only) required to accomplish precision, non-precision, and noninstrument approaches and landings in low visibility weather conditions.

An important part of this program was to identify and document issues concerning operational procedures, safety, performance requirements, and airspace system compatibility. To satisfy the objective, it was necessary to provide test data, flight demonstration, and study of certification issues such that aircraft operators, manufacturers, and government regulators could objectively see the capabilities of current technologies to understand its costs, benefits and risks.

### **1.3 TECHNICAL APPROACH**

A preliminary technology survey was performed with the assistance of experts in the technologies of imaging sensors, image processing and cockpit displays. The survey confirmed the notion that the Synthetic Vision system concept is feasible. The survey also highlighted the numerous challenging technology and systems issues to be resolved. It was clear that insufficient engineering data existed as a basis for accurate performance predictions and for establishing system performance requirements. It was also clear that suitable imaging sensors did not exist in a form suitable for this flight demonstration, even though the state of the art of sensor technology appeared sufficiently advanced. Therefore, before a technology demonstration could be performed, one or more such sensors had to be developed.

While the predicted capability of infrared sensors to image airport scenes in fog and precipitation conditions was not promising, actual performance data for this scenario was not available, and infrared sensor technology could not be discounted. Since the use and development of infrared systems for imaging has been through several generations, it was decided that the project would need only to seek a suitable infrared sensor, rather than develop a new one. The limited resources available for sensor development were to be applied to the development of suitable MMW sensors.

In early 1988, a proof-of-concept demonstration was arranged by the Air Force Wright Laboratory for FAA and other government officials. It was conducted on the Lockheed C-130

High Technology Test Bed, equipped with a modified Flight Dynamics Inc. raster/stroke capable HUD and a Honeywell forward-looking infrared sensor. This demonstration helped the project team visualize the essential elements of an integrated demonstration system. It also helped to convince decision makers that a Synthetic Vision Technology Demonstration was a worthwhile venture and led to commitments for most of the project funding.

Experimental system performance requirements were identified and used as the basis for the selection, acquisition and integration of component systems. It was decided to conduct the flight program on a typical transport category aircraft and, to further establish the capabilities of the sensor technologies as well as satisfy the needs of program participants, an executive class aircraft was selected.

Sensors were to be developed via a competitive procurement in which a major requirement was that sensors be provided within one year for tower testing and, if found suitable, be supported for subsequent flight testing and demonstration. A major objective of the procurement was to explore the capabilities of the variety of sensor frequencies and technologies that were available.

Tower testing of the sensors was carried out with the support of the manufacturers under the auspices of Georgia Tech Research Institute (GTRI), an independent and technically competent organization, in existing USAF avionics test facilities. The tower tests were conducted to document the performance of the sensors in measured weather conditions, to characterize the phenomenology of sensor wavelengths, scene materials and atmospheric conditions, and to assess sensor suitability for flight testing.

Sensors having the requisite performance capabilities were then integrated with the image processing, displays, aircraft instrumentation, weather instrumentation, and data acquisition equipment to produce the experimental Synthetic Vision system necessary for flight testing and demonstration. The functionalities were provided to explore the wide variety of operational applications of the Synthetic Vision concept envisioned by the aviation community, including precision, non-precision and autonomous approach and landing operations.

It was recognized that civil implementation of Synthetic Vision would require certification, and that the risks, costs and methodologies of achieving successful certification are major uncertainties. A study was undertaken of operational, technical and certification issues to provide regulators and potential applicants a clear understanding of the certification process, and to identify difficult issues that might complicate or prevent certification. This study was

organized as a voluntary community activity with extensive participation by all parts of the aviation community including the FAA certification organizations.

#### **1.4 SCOPE**

The diversity in technologies which comprise the Synthetic Vision concept (millimeter-wave sensors, IR sensors, head-up displays, human factors, image processing and systems integration) required the scope to be carefully constrained so as to be able to conduct a meaningful technology demonstration within the program's finite time and financial resources. The experimental system was limited, therefore, to the incorporation in a fixed wing aircraft of existing display technology, millimeter-wave and infrared sensors; and sufficient instrumentation to permit documentation of the weather, sensor system performance, and pilot performance. The scope was further limited to a set of experiments and demonstrations that could be set up and accomplished in approximately one year. Millimeter-wave sensors were developed only to the extent possible in one year. Information fusion was pursued only to the extent necessary to achieve the simultaneous display of stroke symbology with raster imagery on the HUD. Existing techniques for image enhancement were applied only as necessary to sharpen the image of the runway complex.

A related application of weather penetrating sensor technology, the detection of vessels whose masts penetrate the obstruction clearance plane of the ILS approach to Boston's Logan International Airport, was undertaken for the FAA New England Region (the New England Region provided the additional funding required). The Program Office evaluated the capability of the MMW sensor technology for this use, developed system requirements and estimated acquisition costs for the Regional Office.

## **2. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT OVERVIEW**

### **2.1. MANAGEMENT APPROACH**

The Technology Survey revealed engineering challenges requiring a diverse contribution of expertise, facilities and financial resources that only a joint team of government agencies and industry could provide. This team was led by the Federal Aviation Administration and assembled over the course of the program. A diagram of the project management team is found in Figure 1.

#### **2.1.1. Federal Aviation Administration**

The FAA initiated this project at the direction of the Administrator, Mr. T. Allan McArtor. It was managed within the FAA Research and Development Service under the Associate Administrator for Development and System Engineering. Inter-agency agreements with the Air Force, National Oceanic And Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) were used extensively for this project. The FAA transferred the majority of the project funds to the Air Force, but also transferred funds to NOAA for a grant to the Maryland Advanced Development Laboratory and to NASA for administrative and technical support and official travel.

#### **2.1.2. Specialized Technical Experts**

Throughout the course of the project, the advice of specialized technical experts was sought to understand technical system requirements, to provide independent assessments during the progress of sensor developments, and to maintain the validity of the experiments and data analyses.

Dr. Robert D. Hayes of RDH Incorporated, an expert in millimeter wave sensor performance, assessed the available technology in weather penetrating sensors, contributed to the development of prototype sensor requirements, advised the management team during design reviews, developed theoretical predictions of sensor performance in weather, and advised the data analysis teams. Dr. Hayes also defined the system requirements for the proposed Harbor Vessel Detection System at Boston's Logan International Airport.

Mr. Paul Mengers of PAULTEK Incorporated, designer and inventor of electro-optical and image-processing systems, assessed the state of the art of real time image enhancement

technology, developed a new scheme for evaluating the quality of sensor imagery obtained during the flight




Figure 1. Synthetic Vision Program Management Team

test program, and designed and built an optical system for through-the-HUD inflight video recordings.

Dr. J. Allen Zak of Hughes/STX, a meteorologist, provided essential expertise regarding atmospheric conditions encountered during aircraft operations and the sources and types of instrumentation required to measure those conditions. He participated in the development of the Synthetic Vision tower test plan and the plans for atmospheric data collection at the tower and in the aircraft, and performed reduction and quality control of the data collected during the flight tests. Dr. Zak coordinated the real time nationwide weather forecasting that led to successful encounters with the special cases of low visibility, rain and snow conditions. Dr. Zak served throughout the program as a member of the Program Office, participating in program planning, schedule and resource tracking, coordinating the support activities of the technical experts, and progress reporting. He was responsible for the coordination of the Harbor Vessel Detection Requirements Study.

### **2.1.3. U.S. Air Force**

The United States Air Force Wright Laboratory, Flight Dynamics Directorate, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH, was the lead Air Force organization. In 1988 the Autonomous Landing Guidance (ALG) Project, managed by the Flight Controls Division, was investigating concepts using infrared and millimeter-wave imaging sensors to produce images on head-up displays in conjunction with other symbology on the HUD; concepts which were common to the Synthetic Vision System concept. The FAA and Air Force agreed to collaborate in a joint Synthetic Vision Technology Demonstration Project to capitalize on the existing efforts and research capabilities at Wright Laboratory. The Wright Laboratory also assigned personnel to full time positions as the Deputy Program Manager, resident in the Synthetic Vision Program Office, and as the Tower Test Director, resident at Wright Patterson AFB.

Wright Laboratory possessed technical expertise, engineering research and test facilities, and contracting capabilities that were particularly well suited for this project. Of early benefit to the project was the Lockheed C-130 High Technology Test Bed, made available by the Air Force via the ALG program, for a proof-of-concept demonstration. The Air Force Materiel Command at Wright Patterson AFB also made available the Program Research and Development Announcement (PRDA) contracting method that can shorten competitive procurement time and

was used for the sensor development task. Finally, the Air Force Avionics Directorate provided a unique tower facility for avionics testing which overlooks an unused but instrumented runway complex, that was ideal for the performance testing of promising Synthetic Vision sensors. The Flight Control Division accepted primary responsibility for the sensor development and sensor performance tower tests.

The Directorate of Materiel Management, Sacramento Air Logistics Center (SM-ALC) McClellan AFB, CA, another Air Force Materiel Command organization, manages the Microelectronic Technology Support Program (MTSP) on behalf of the Air Force and other government agencies. A key element of MTSP is a set of competitively awarded contracts that are uniquely and flexibly designed to assist government agencies with microelectronics and advanced technology projects. On behalf of the Synthetic Vision Program, the MTSP Program provided and oversaw contracts for an additional sensor development and testing task, and for the system integration, flight demonstration and documentation of the experimental Synthetic Vision System.

#### **2.1.4. U.S. Navy**

The Carrier Operations Directorate (OP55) and NAVAIR were the primary participating Navy organizations. The Navy is pursuing technologies that improve carrier approach and landing capabilities at night and in low visibilities. The Signature Managed Air Traffic Control, Approach and Landing System (SMATCALS) program under the sponsorship of OP-55 is an umbrella program for the development of a variety of shipboard and airborne systems in support of carrier air traffic control and landing tasks. The Navy interest centered on the potential suitability of Synthetic Vision for use by the pilot to monitor approaches conducted by automatic carrier landing systems. The Navy SMATCALS program provided funding to the Program in 1990 for the sensor development effort. Personnel from the Naval Air Warfare Center, Patuxent Naval Air Station, MD, participated in sensor design technical meetings, Certification Issues Study Team meetings, and in-flight demonstrations of the experimental system.

#### **2.1.5. Maryland Advanced Development Laboratory**

The Maryland Advanced Development Laboratory (MADL) of Greenbelt, Md, is a non-profit affiliate of the University of Maryland. MADL participation was funded by the project through a NOAA grant and an inter-agency agreement between NOAA and the FAA, and included initial planning tasks, assessment of current technology, planning for simulation tasks, definition of projected performance requirements, and formation of the Certification Issues Study Team.

### **2.1.6. Participating Industry Organizations**

This technology demonstration project was dependent on the knowledge, experience, resources, and engineering capabilities of private industry. Numerous firms voluntarily contributed time, engineering talent, and equipment to this effort for little or no compensation. Major government contracts were also required to prepare for and complete the demonstration. The scope of these contracts and the participating industry organizations are identified below.

In April 1989, an Air Force Program Research and Development Announcement (PRDA) was published by Wright Laboratory in the Commerce Business Daily inviting bids to design, develop, tower test and flight test an imaging weather penetrating sensor. Ten proposals were submitted, and TRW, Lear Astronics, Martin Marietta, and Eastman Kodak were awarded Phase 1 contracts to provide sensor designs. After the sensor design presentations, the project selected Lear Astronics to build and test their 94 GHz Frequency Modulated Continuous Wave (FMCW) radar. Meanwhile, Wright Laboratory, on behalf on an Air Force project, awarded contracts to Kodak and TRW for development of their designs.


The design of a 94 GHz radar, by Lear Astronics Corporation of Santa Monica, CA, was quite innovative, offering the potential of impressive performance with moderate development risk. Designed specifically for the Synthetic Vision Technology Demonstration, it was selected as the primary and most promising candidate for experimental prototype integration and flight test. However, successful and timely completion of the tower tests and suitability flight tests was a prerequisite to full scale flight testing.

The risk of depending on a single sensor development for the flight demonstration and the need for characterization of 35 GHz sensor performance led to a contract with Honeywell Systems Research Center of Bloomington, MN, for design and fabrication of a sensor at that frequency. Honeywell had previously manufactured 35 GHz radars for another Air Force application that, with the addition of a suitable antenna and an upgraded signal processor, could be used for tower testing and perhaps flight testing. On behalf of the project, the Air Force Sacramento Air Logistics Center, Microelectronics Technology Support Program, awarded the contract to Honeywell in June 1991. It was modified in December 1991 to upgrade the radar to a flight worthy configuration and to provide flight test support when it became clear it would be needed as the primary test sensor.

Wright Laboratory offered modest contracts to other sensor manufacturers to bring existing sensors to the tower for Synthetic Vision performance testing. One such contract was awarded in October 1991 to UTC/Norden Systems of Norwalk, CT, to test their 95 GHz TALONS radar system. The tests were conducted successfully from October 1991 through February 1992. The Program also tested in the tower facility the 3-5 micron FLIR camera designed in the design competition phase and built for the Air Force by Eastman Kodak of Rochester, NY. Kodak also provided and supported another version of the same design in the flight test phase of the Program through an arrangement with TRW.

Georgia Technology Research Institute (GTRI) of Marietta, GA, was awarded contracts by Wright Laboratory and TRW to independently analyze sensor performance data in the Tower Test and Flight Test phases of the Program. Under the first contract, awarded by Wright Laboratory in April 1991 for the tower tests, GTRI wrote portions of the test plan, developed data collection and reduction software, calibrated each sensor, and completed the sensor performance analysis. TRW also awarded a subcontract to GTRI in August 1991 for support of the flight test task.

The Air Force Microelectronic Technology Support Program issued a delivery order to TRW Military Electronics and Avionics Division (MEAD), of San Diego, CA, to serve as the prime contractor for the System Integration, Evaluation and Demonstration (SEID) task of the Technology Demonstration. The division of responsibilities between TRW and the participating organizations is illustrated in Figure 2.



**Figure 2. Experimental System Integration and Flight Test Team**

An important element of the cooperative management approach for the System Integration, Evaluation and Demonstration (SIED) task, agreed to between TRW, the MTSP contracting office, and the Synthetic Vision Program Office, was the level of attention given to the Program Plan and within it, the Resource Allocation Plan. The Program Plan was developed as an expansion of the contract Task Assignment Plan as a joint effort on the part of all the participants. The Resource Allocation Plan consisted of the planned monthly spending for each major line item in the Work Breakdown Structure, found in the Program Plan, over the life of the contract. The Program Office, the TRW managers, and the subcontract managers monitored actual spending with respect to the plan, anticipated problems, and were able to make informed and timely adjustments. While it was consistent with the contractor's monthly financial reporting system required by the government, the Resource Allocation Plan provided more detail and provided the information in a more timely fashion.

## **2.2. SCHEDULE**

The schedule for the Synthetic Vision Technology Demonstration project is presented in Figure 3. Each of the schedule elements shown is briefly discussed below; an overview of each of the major program elements is provided in section 3 of this Executive Summary.

### **2.2.1. Technology Survey**

Early activity in 1988 provided, in a preliminary form, program definition, the technical feasibility, and cost estimates to complete the project. It also included, through early Air Force cooperation, the proof of concept flights with the Lockheed C-130 High Technology Test Bed. The preliminary technology assessment was completed in January 1989.

### **2.2.2 Estimated Demonstration System Performance Requirements**

The definition of performance requirements for the demonstration system commenced in early 1989 in preparation for the sensor research and development announcement and source selection. In 1989 the Maryland Advanced Development Laboratory (MADL) began integration of a low cost laboratory test bench system incorporating equipment provided to the Program by industry including a GEC HUD, an infrared sensor, and a processor intended to degrade the infrared sensor performance in a way that might approximate a millimeter wave sensor's performance. The MADL notion was to move this test bed system into a light aircraft to provide an SVS simulation facility with which to further understand the technical issues and to assist in establishing the performance requirements for the demonstration system to be constructed by TRW and others in industry for the Synthetic Vision Program. The MADL task was terminated in October 1990, because it could not be completed within the budget and time allotted.

### **2.2.3. Sensor Development and Tower Testing.**

A pre bidders' conference for the sensor development competition was held at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in October 1988. A Program Research and Development Announcement was published in the Commerce Business Daily in April 1989, the first contracts awarded in January 1990. Four contractors were selected to perform sensor design studies, which were presented in late March and early April 1990. Lear Astronics Corporation was awarded a contract to build and test a 94 GHz sensor system in June 1990 for delivery in April 1991. Lear Astronics completed the initial version of the sensor in August 1991, but it was not suitable for tower testing and the Lear Astronics sensor development contract was terminated in

January 1992. In August 1992, under a TRW subcontract, Lear Astronics provided an updated version of the 94 GHz sensor for tower testing to evaluate flight worthiness and establish baseline performance. It was found conditionally suitable and sent to the aircraft at the end of September 1992.




Figure 3. Synthetic Vision Technology Demonstration Program Schedule

**Preliminary sensor tower tests at the Air Force Target Characterization Facility** commenced in May 1991. An Air Force owned 35 GHz sensor was first tested in May 1991 to validate the test plan procedures, data acquisition and reduction systems. Tests of the initial Lear Astronics 94 GHz sensor were performed in August 1991. A 95 GHz Norden Systems radar was successfully tested from November 1991 through February 1992. An Air Force Kodak 3-5 micron imaging infrared system was tested from March through May 1992. The flight configuration of the Honeywell 35 GHz sensor system was tested from April to May 1992, found conditionally satisfactory for flight, and then installed on the flight test aircraft in June 1992. Reports of all tower test results were provided in January 1993 by the tower test contractor, Georgia Technology Research Institute.

A contract was awarded in June 1991 to Honeywell, Inc. to build a new antenna and provide an integrated 35 GHz radar system for tower and limited flight testing by October 1991. After it was learned that Lear Astronics could not deliver a suitable system in time for tower and flight testing, the Honeywell contract was modified in December 1991, to provide a fully flightworthy system by February 1992. The Honeywell system was delivered and submitted to hot bench testing in February, returned to Honeywell for modifications in March, and sent to the Air Force for Tower Testing at the end of March. Shakedown flight testing began in mid May.

#### **2.2.4. Experimental System Integration, Evaluation and Demonstration**

A contract was awarded in March 1991 to TRW as the prime contractor for design and integration of the experimental flight demonstration system and conduct of flight test activity. Modifications to the Gulfstream II test aircraft were completed in December 1991, hot bench testing in February 1992, and final integration of the experimental system in May 1992. Shakedown flights were conducted in May and June. Full scale flight tests began in July 1992 with the 35 GHz sensor system, a GEC head-up display and a Kodak 3-5 micron infrared camera. In October, the 35 GHz system was temporarily removed and the Lear Astronics 94 GHz sensor installed and flight tested. The 35 GHz system returned in November and flight tests continued until mid December. The final report on this activity was provided in February 1993.

#### **2.2.5. Certification Issues Study Team**

The Certification Issues Study Team was organized in 1989, holding its first meeting in March, and the last of eight plenary sessions in January 1993. The draft advisory circular and certification roadmap were completed by the team and presented at the sixth meeting in March 1991.

### **2.2.6. Harbor Vessel Detection Systems Requirements**

The Harbor Vessel Detection Systems Requirements task began in mid 1990 with a definition of the user's functional requirement to detect and locate tall ships in the Boston Harbor. A Memorandum of Understanding between the FAA New England Region and FAA R&D Service was signed in August 1990, sensor performance tests were conducted from May 1991 through August 1992, and the system specification document provided to the New England Region in January 1993.

### **2.3. BUDGET**

Total funding for the program was \$14,624,000 from the following sources: \$11.36 million from the FAA; \$3.0 million from other government agencies; \$214,000 from the Navy; and \$50,000 from the Air Force. There were additional contributions in time and equipment from industry, especially Honeywell, Lear Astronics, GEC Avionics, Douglas Aircraft Company, Eastman Kodak, and Petersen Aviation. The Air Force also contributed significant time and facilities not reflected in the above figures. These funds were distributed to major task elements as follows:

<u>Element</u>	<u>Allocation ( \$ million)</u>
Demonstration System Performance Requirements	1.2
Sensor Development	3.8
Tower Sensor Testing	1.0
System Integration, Evaluation & Demonstration	7.7
Administration, Travel, Management Support	0.9

The major expense, \$7.7 million, was the provision, modification, and flight of the G-II test aircraft. The \$3.8 million for sensor development included the development and provision of the 94 GHz millimeter wave sensor system and the modification, and provision of the 35 GHz millimeter wave sensor system. Testing of these and other sensors on the instrumented tower facility cost about one million dollars, as did the performance requirements activity. Administrative expenses, management support contract, and extensive travel for the pilots and project management team required \$900,000 over the course of the program.

### **3. TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ELEMENTS**

#### **3.1. TECHNOLOGY SURVEY**

A technical advisory team, assembled for the project under a grant to the Maryland Advanced Development Laboratory (MADL) conducted a survey of current Synthetic Vision technology areas and published the Preliminary Technology Assessment Report in January 1989. The objectives of the survey were to verify the feasibility of a demonstration with current technology, identify important technical issues and estimate system performance requirements. The requirements listed below are not the final findings of this project, which are described later in this volume in Section 3.4.7 (Sensor Performance), Section 3.4.8 (Image Quality), Section 3.4.9 (Pilot/System Performance) and Section 3.4.5 (Lessons Learned). A result of a sixty day study, they were meant to be used for program planning; that is, to determine what must be done to achieve a flight demonstration, to develop a realistic schedule, to estimate costs and to establish resource priorities.

##### **3.1.1. Estimated Demonstration System Requirements**

System requirements for the experimental demonstration system were founded on the assumption that a head up display (HUD) would present sensor derived imagery of the airport scene and essential avionics information that would enable the pilot to manually perform the approach, flare, landing, rollout and taxi, in spite of low visibility conditions. Imagery and position related avionics information would be projected conformally in position and scale, such that in visual conditions, image features, such as the runway, on the HUD would perfectly correspond with the real world. The system would ideally be independent of ground based navigation aids and would have sufficient reliability to meet experimental aircraft certification requirements.

- **System Requirements.** The team proposed the following functional system requirements:
  - Minimum range for runway acquisition: 7000 feet from the threshold.
  - Accurate horizontal and vertical image registration.
  - Image processing in real-time , (i.e. negligible display latency ).
  - Obstacle detection sufficient to confirm a clear runway.
  - Enable touchdown accuracy laterally within 27 feet of centerline, and longitudinally within 700 feet of the touchdown zone.
  - Provide flare cues to enable touchdown accuracy.
  - For fail operational system components, probability of failure  $10^{-9}$

- **Sensor Requirements.**

The following key sensor requirements were proposed to provide an adequate imagery system:

- Azimuth resolution (beamwidth): 0.3° desired, 0.7° maximum
- Signal to Noise Ratio: 15 dB minimum.
- Minimum acquisition ranges: 7000 feet (landing), 1500 feet (taxi)
- Elevation of obstacles must be depicted during taxi operations.
- Image update rate: 15 Hertz desired, 10 Hertz minimum.
- Field of View: azimuth 35° with 180° slew range, by elevation 20° to allow +3°, -17° pitch.
- Form and fit compatible with commercial transport, such as B-727, C-130.
- Sensor controls: automatic frequency and gain, and manual contrast and brightness.
- Stabilization in Pitch, roll and heading, with manual heading adjustment.

- **Image Processing Requirements.**

The required extent of image enhancement is dependent on system design and, in particular, on the inherent performance of the sensor. A sensor that already produces high contrast and high resolution requires less image enhancement. At the most promising millimeter wavelengths, the space limitations for the antenna aperture tend to reduce gain and resolution. Also, at the shorter wavelengths, limitations in transmission power can decrease image contrast. Consequently, in addition to the items listed below, contrast enhancement, edge sharpening and deconvolution techniques may be required to improve the "raw" sensor output.

- Produce imagery with a minimum of 8 shades of grey.
- For RADARs, provide for accurate measurement of height above runway for scan conversion.
- Compute accurate geometric corrections for all aircraft attitudes.

- **Display Requirements.**

The HUD must provide a useful display in a variety of cockpit ambient lighting and scene illumination conditions. The following minimum requirements were proposed:

- Simultaneous display of raster video (RS-170) and stroke symbology.
- Field of view: minimum 35° wide by 20° high.
- Form and fit compatible with commercial transport cockpit.
- Reflective holographic combiner.

### **3.1.2 Technical and Systems Issues To Be Resolved.**

The team found several issues needing resolution. They are summarized below:

#### **Sensors.**

- Is the optimum technology active radar or passive radiometer?
- Is 35 GHz or 94 GHz the best frequency?
- Is infrared (FLIR) useful for some operations? If so, at 3 to 5 microns or 8 to 12?

#### **Image Processing.**

- How much and what kinds are required?
- Can required image processing be performed at the required image update rate?

#### **Registration.**

- Can the accuracy of image and HUD registration be achieved and maintained?

#### **HUD Symbology.**

- What information must be displayed and is it compatible with the display of the imagery?

#### **Weather Models.**

- Are current models sufficient to predict sensor performance in all weather conditions?

#### **Reliability.**

- Can the required levels be realized?

## 3.2 SENSOR DEVELOPMENT

The objective of the sensor development effort was to obtain at least one imaging, weather penetrating sensor to enable flight demonstration of the Synthetic Vision concept in zero-zero conditions. Sensor development was necessary because an existing sensor, satisfactory for flight demonstration of the Synthetic Vision concept, had not been found. Nevertheless, sensor technology did seem to be sufficiently advanced; so the need was to redesign current technology into a suitable package for the flight demonstration. It was estimated that the sensor development would take a manufacturer twelve months, at an estimated cost of \$2 million, including the follow on test support.

### 3.2.1. Demonstration Sensor System Guidelines for Bidders

The guidelines provided to potential bidders for development of the demonstration sensor system stated that to support low visibility landing operations, the sensor must produce an image of the runway and adjacent complex at long enough ranges to permit a safe descent. The image of the runway must have sufficient contrast and resolution to enable the pilot to detect it, identify it and track its location. The sensor system with the integrated aircraft avionics and headup display (HUD) must accurately register the image with the outside view and correct for aircraft roll, pitch and yaw maneuvers. Finally the sensor must produce the image with a variety of surface materials and conditions, and through a variety of atmospheric obscurants (fog, rain, snow). Precise specifications were difficult to define so the following guidelines were provided to the bidders:

- Range (kilometers):	Enable Runway Detection	5
	Enable Runway Identification	3
	Confirm Obstacle Clear Runway	2

- Assume three degree glide slope.
- System must be entirely self-contained; no ground aids required to land.
- Capable of supporting flight evaluations/demonstrations in fog, rain and snow.
- Form, fit and function capable of integration on executive class jet aircraft; like Gulfstream
- Produce image in real-time and in real world perspective for display head up.

The project expected to learn more about systems requirements from the first phase of the development contracts in which design studies and technology tradeoff analyses would be performed.

### **3.2.2 Competitive Procurement.**

The Air Force Flight Dynamics Directorate at Wright Patterson AFB conducted the competitive procurement for sensor development using a Program Research and Development Announcement. Requirements could be generally described in the announcement and the bidders would provide more detail in their proposals, and if selected, in their Phase 1 design studies. The project allocated \$4 million for this multi-award, firm-fixed price, four phase effort. The government retained the right to discontinue the contracts at the end of each phase. The four phases were:

**Phase 1 - Design Study.** A two month effort to perform trade-off analyses of promising technical approaches and a detailed sensor design. The government expected to select four contractors for this phase at approximately \$150 thousand each, and select a subset of these for fabrication and testing.

**Phase 2 - Fabrication.** A ten month effort in which the selected contractor(s) would build an airworthy brassboard sensor that could be modified with minimum effort for test aircraft integration and flight test. The contractors were required to analyze and report on the risk of aircraft integration two months before completion of the this phase.

**Phase 3 - Test Support.** Selected contractors would provide on-site assistance for the installation, calibration, maintenance and data collection during sensor performance testing at the Wright Laboratory Tower facility and aboard the test aircraft. The government and contractors would share all data from their respective sensor tests.

**Phase 4 - Final Report.** The contractor(s) would provide data and technical advice to the tower test contractor (GTRI) for the preparation of the sensor performance test report, and write a separate report from their point of view.

Ten bidders submitted proposals and of these, four were awarded Phase 1 contracts totalling \$576,000. These four provided a good cross section of candidate technologies. They were:

- Eastman Kodak proposed a 3-5 Micron platinum-silicide forward looking infrared radiometer.
- Martin Marietta proposed a 35 GHz pulse radar with an electro-mechanical scanning antenna.
- Lear Astronics proposed a 94 GHz FMCW Radar with a mechanical scanning Antenna.
- TRW proposed a passive 94 GHz focal plane array radiometer.

Following evaluation of the design studies, the Synthetic Vision project chose one, the Lear Astronics design, for Phase 2 Fabrication. The Kodak FLIR offered impressive performance, but according to the manufacturer's analysis could not promise sufficient range in fog and rain to serve as the primary sensor. The TRW 94 GHz radiometer was a very interesting system, but a configuration with sufficient field-of-view could not be fabricated in time for the flight activity.


The Flight Dynamics Directorate, in association with the Avionics Directorate, the Navy, Rome Air Development Center, and others, proceeded with fabrication of the Kodak FLIR and a modified configuration of the TRW radiometer. Both are passive sensor designs.

### **3.2.3. 94 GHz Radar Fabrication.**

The Phase 2 fixed price contract was awarded to Lear Astronics in late June 1990 and required delivery of a working system by the end of April 1991. The fabrication schedule was extremely aggressive, however the sensor was not ready by April 1991. By the end of May, believing the radar lacked sufficient performance, the contractor attempted to enhance it with new components to increase power and reduce system losses. As a result of these difficulties, the government sought to arrange an acceptance test, in August 1991, prior to a Phase 3 commitment. In January 1992, after several attempts to reach an agreement, the government accepted delivery of the system and terminated the contract without proceeding to Phase 3. Later, Lear Astronics made new arrangements to conduct an acceptance test and proceed to the test aircraft, under a subcontract to the prime contractor for flight integration and testing, TRW. The sensor in the configuration in which it was tested in the tower is shown in Figure 4.

### **3.2.4. 35 GHz Sensor Procurement and Fabrication**


Because only one sensor, the Lear Astronics 94 GHz radar, was chosen for the competitive development, the project lacked the means to test and characterize 35 GHz performance. A search for 35 GHz sensors yielded a relatively low cost solution; an existing radar built for another Air Force application. To be assembled with components from the manufacturer, Honeywell, Inc., and the Air Force, this system would be tested at the tower to obtain the desired 35 GHz



**Figure 4. Lear Astronics 94 GHz SVS Imaging Radar**

performance and phenomenology data. The project funded fabrication of a new electromechanical scanning antenna, built by Malibu Research Associates, that was designed in a form and fit suitable for potential flight tests. As a result of this activity, the program would not only obtain 35 GHz data, but also a backup sensor for the flight tests, in case the higher risk 94 GHz radar development was not successful.

In June 1991, Honeywell was awarded a delivery order by the Microelectronics Technology Support Program at the Air Force Sacramento Air Logistics Center, to provide an integrated sensor system for tower testing. The delivery order was modified in December 1991, after it became clear that the primary flight test sensor would not be ready in time. The modification entailed sensor system upgrades for flightworthiness, engineering support for aircraft integration, and flight test support. The 35 GHz sensor was delivered in February 1992, hot bench integration testing was successfully completed, and the sensor was sent to the Air Force tower in March. The components of the sensor are shown in Figure 5.



**Figure 5. Honeywell 35 GHz SVS Imaging Radar Components**

### 3.3. SENSOR TOWER TESTING.

Sensors that can produce images of the airport scene through fog and precipitation represent the key enabling technology for Synthetic Vision. Primary objectives of the tower tests were to calibrate each sensor, develop a performance data base, determine performance in clear weather, determine performance in low visibility fog, rain and snow conditions, and establish suitability for flight testing. An additional objective was to learn as much as possible about the characteristics of the low visibility weather conditions that affected sensor performance.

The Wright Laboratory Avionics Directorate owns and operates the Target System Characterization Facility, otherwise called the tower facility at Wright Patterson AFB, which overlooks a heavily instrumented, non-operational runway complex at a look-down angle of 3.5 degrees as shown in Figure 6. A top view drawing of the area with some of the key landmarks is provided in Figure 7. It is an ideal site for sensor testing in a controlled environment. The elevated sensor test position at the tower was equipped by the SVS Program with a precision data acquisition system consisting of an automated motion table, computer with high capacity hard drives and digital frame grabber, high resolution camcorder, video recorders, video monitors, and blackbody calibration sources. GTRI designed the data acquisition system and wrote software that automated data collection and also allowed "quick looks" at the data through imagery and signal levels to monitor test progress and data quality. The runway scene was equipped with calibrated reflectors for millimeter wave measurements and an extensive meteorological measurement suite. This suite enabled the collection of temperature, radiance, humidity, rain rate, drop size, and visual range data at high sample rates. The Wright-Patterson AFB weather station provided tailored forecasts and observations in support of the tests.





Figure 6. Elevation drawing of test area.

The scene dimensions, feature locations, and surface materials were surveyed to provide precise ground truth for comparison with sensor performance.

The Air Force Wright Laboratory Control Systems Development and Applications Branch assumed responsibility for the planning and conduct of the tower tests and assigned a Tower Test Director. The Tower Test Director served as the technical point of contact for the procurements of test equipment, meteorological instrumentation and data reduction, separate contracts with sensor providers, and the contract for the Tower Test Support with GTRI. The Tower Test Director managed the development and publication of the Tower Test Plan which served not only the Synthetic Vision project, but also other sensor test tasks at the same facility. The Synthetic Vision Program Office defined test objectives. GTRI, and the technical consultants wrote major technical sections such as the requirements for data elements, instrumentation, analysis methodology, data management, and test procedures for the various types of sensors. The plan was completed and approved in May 1991. GTRI had primary responsibility for the actual data management, reduction, and analysis. Preliminary sensor tests were conducted during that summer to validate and refine the test plan. It was revised in August 1991 to add the detailed "Radar Method of Test" and in February 1992 to add the detailed "IR Method of Test" (not a full scale tower test) was conducted in August 1992. The Tower Test Schedule is shown in Figure 8.

The Tower Test Plan required that baseline tests of each sensor be conducted to calibrate the system parameters and provide the ideal clear air performance control data set for comparison with sensor performance in fog, rain and snow. The planned test matrix called for a minimum of twelve complete data runs of four different weather categories with three runs each. The four categories were clear air, fog, rain and snow. The maximum prevailing visibility for the latter three categories was 1 1/2 miles. For the infrared sensors, 24 hour duration diurnal baseline tests were conducted because of the performance dependencies on sun angle, thermal history, and time of day.



**Figure 7. Top View Drawing of Test Area**

## Sensor System Tower Test Schedule




Figure 8. Synthetic Vision Sensor Tower Test Schedule

### 3.3.1 Sensor Characteristics

#### 3.3.1.1 MMW Radar Sensors

A millimeter-wave (MMW) radar sensor exploits the differences in radar cross section between paved runway and bordering grass surface areas to image a runway scene, as shown in Figure 9. Radar cross section (RCS) is a measure of a target's ability to reflect radar waves. At the low incident angles encountered by an synthetic vision (SV) radar, most of the radar illumination energy is forward scattered from the smooth, low-RCS runway, and very little is backscattered to the radar receiver. The "rougher" grass areas have medium RCS and return a higher portion of the incident radar energy. A radar reflector is designed specifically to have high RCS and backscatters a large portion of the incident radar energy.




Figure 9. MMW radar detection of a runway.

MMW sensors were selected for tower testing that could image the example runway scene with sufficient resolution to demonstrate synthetic vision sensor technology. Initially, the primary MMW test sensor was a 94 GHz radar developed by Lear Astronics under the Air Force Program Research and Development Announcement (PRDA) #89-4-PMRN. Late availability of the Lear sensor for tower testing led to the inclusion of a substitute 95 GHz radar sensor from Norden Systems for the purpose of collecting data at the 94-95 GHz frequency. The Norden TALONS radar pod was adapted from its flight test configuration to collect radar performance data through the winter months. An Air Force 35 GHz radar sensor had successfully imaged the runway scene in 1990 under another project sponsored by the FAA and Air Force, so the Air Force 35 GHz sensor was tested early in this project. During 1991-1992, Honeywell Incorporated developed a flight test configuration 35 GHz radar sensor with scanning antenna that was also tested at the tower.

The complete operating specifications for each test sensor were determined at least once during the testing period. Some characterization activities required partial disassembly of the test sensor and the use of special purpose test equipment, so more frequent measurement of these parameters was not practical. Some of the specifications had to be ascertained from previous off-site measurements or from manufacturer's test data. The six mmw radar sensors tested at the tower and their pertinent specifications are listed in Table 1.

**Table 1. MMw Radar Sensors Tested At Tower**

Sensor Code	Manufacturer	Frequency	Waveform	Antenna /Polarization	Signal Processor	Remarks
LA1	Lear Astronics	94 GHz	FMCW	parabolic* /circular	DSP	developmental
LA2	Lear Astronics	94 GHz	FMCW	parabolic** /vertical	DSP & EVS	SVTD candidate
NS1	Norden Systems	95 GHz	pulsed	parabolic /circular	none	non-candidate
HI1	U.S. Air Force	35 GHz	pulsed	slotted W/G /horizontal	none	non-candidate
HI2	Honeywell Inc.	35 GHz	pulsed	slotted W/G /circular †	DSP	SVTD candidate
HI3	Honeywell Inc.	35 GHz	pulsed	slotted W/G /horizontal	none	non-candidate

\* Front-fed dual parabolic reflector with gear drive

\*\* Cassegrain fed dual parabolic reflector with resonant scan

† Slotted waveguide fed reflector with electromechanical "Eagle scan"

Abbreviations: W/G = waveguide, DSP = digital signal processor, EVS = video processor

A sensor configuration code based on the manufacturer's name and a configuration sequence number was established to label the data from each sensor tested. Two configurations of the Lear Astronics 94 GHz radar sensor, an Air Force 35 GHz radar sensor, and two configurations of Honeywell 35 GHz radar sensors were tested; the configurations differed in antenna selection, transmitter, and signal processor. The Norden Systems TALONS 95 GHz radar, although not considered a candidate Synthetic Vision sensor, provided the most extensive set of MMW radar adverse weather performance data collected on this project. Only the LA2 and HI2 radars were SVTD candidate MMW radar sensors and continued on to flight testing.

### 3.3.1.2. Infrared Sensors

An infrared (IR) sensor is able to image a runway scene based on the differences in temperature, emissivity, and reflectivity of the pavement areas and the bordering grass-covered areas, as shown in Figure 10. An IR camera receives thermal radiance from the scene surfaces, and a lens focuses that energy on a sensitive detector element or array of elements. The

wavelength range accepted by an IR camera is based on the type of sensitive detector element used. Image contrast is developed by the differences in radiance received from the typically warmer pavement and the typically cooler grass areas within an airport scene. The actual radiance difference is a function of environmental heating and cooling during the daily cycle, grass moisture, and meteorological events.

The IR sensor systems used in the SVTD program to collect data in the 3 to 5 micron infrared band were focal plane array cameras with Stirling-cycle refrigeration for sensor cooling. Most of the infrared image data were collected with the Kodak Model KIR-310 infrared camera system, shown in Figure 11 as it was installed in the tower test facility. Image data were also acquired with a Mitsubishi Electric Corporation model IR-5120C infrared camera. Both of these instruments utilized platinum-silicide (PtSi) focal plane array sensors and provided the image data in an RS-170 video signal format. Important characteristics of the two camera systems are listed in Table 2.





Figure 10. IR detection of a runway.



**Figure 11. Kodak 3-5 micron Sensor System Used In Tower Tests**

**Table 2. Characteristics Of Camera Systems**

Characteristic	Kodak KIR-310	Mitsubishi IR-5120C
Detector	PtSi FPA	Si FPA
Number of array elements	640X486	512X512
Response band	3.2-4.1 microns	3-5 microns
Lens focal length	27.5 mm	50 mm
Lens aperture	f/1.7	f/1.2
Field of view	32°X25°	14°X11°
NEDT (Noise Equivalent Difference Temperature )	0.17° C	0.15° C
Cooling method	Stirling cooler	Stirling cooler
Analog output	RS-170 video	RS-170 video

### **2.3.2. Sensor Performance Measures**

Sensor performance features are a measure of a sensor's effectiveness in imaging the airport scene and are specific to the individual sensor design. Phenomenology characterizes the test scene environment in fundamental engineering values that are related to the sensor wavelength but are independent of a particular sensor design. Resolution and contrast are examples of sensor performance features. Examples of phenomenology values are radar cross section for a target or clutter area, volumetric radar cross section for precipitation, and atmospheric attenuation. Radar phenomenology values are frequency sensitive.

#### **2.3.2.1. Performance Features**

Sensor data collected during tower tests were processed to extract the specific sensor performance features listed in Table 3. These performance features were selected to apply equally well to the MMW and IR imaging sensors tested at the tower. Prior to feature extraction, the "raw" sensor data were converted into standard units of measure appropriate to each sensor technology. MMW radar sensor data were calibrated to units of equivalent received power, and IR sensor data, to units of equivalent received radiance. The term "signal" in this context refers to the amplitude values of the calibrated sensor data. The specific formulas for calculating the performance features are presented in Sections 7.1 (MMW) and 7.2 (IR) of Volume 2 (Sensor Tower Testing) of this report.

**Table 3. Sensor Performance Features**

Feature Name		Description
Contrast	C	Difference in received signal between runway and background (grass) areas, normalized to the background signal.
Signal-to-variability ratio	SVR	Ratio of received signal to the standard deviation of received signal.
Sharpness	S	Reciprocal of the horizontal angle between two areas of differing signal level.
Range (or elevation angle) resolution	DR	Smallest range or angle at which two objects can be resolved by the sensor.
Azimuth resolution	DA	Smallest horizontal angle at which two objects can be resolved by the sensor within 3 dB.

### 2.3.2.2 Phenomenology

Phenomenology is the science of observing physical events. Radar and IR phenomenology observe the responses of the environment to an electromagnetic sensor. The measured responses are normalized to units of distance, area, or volume, so that the results can be expressed in values independent of the specific test sensor used to make the measurements. Phenomenology values are useful for predicting the performance of other MMW or IR sensors in a similar operating environment. The phenomenology features that were extracted from the MMW radar sensor data are listed in Table 4, along with a brief description.


**Table 4. MMW Phenomenology Features**

Feature Name	Abbreviation	Description
Normalized RCS	$\sigma^0$	Radar cross section per unit area of surface.
Atmospheric attenuation	$\alpha$	Reduction of apparent target RCS due to airborne material (liquid water).
Volumetric RCS	$\sigma_v$	RCS of the airborne water, normalized to volume.

A calibrated radar sensor can measure the RCS of a target or clutter area by substituting received power values into the radar range equation and solving for RCS. The resulting RCS is expressed in units of square meters or decibels relative to one square meter of RCS. This RCS measure is appropriate for characterizing a "point" target such as a vehicle or an area of clutter comprised of collection of objects, either natural or man-made. Radar clutter can be localized, such as a single tree, or distributed over relatively homogeneous extended surface areas, such as pavement or grass.

Conditions in the intervening atmosphere between a MMW radar and a target can degrade the radar's ability to detect and image that target, as shown in Figure 12. Airborne moisture due to fog and precipitation (rain, sleet, or snow) causes scattering and diffusion of the radar's electromagnetic waves. Atmospheric effects are separated into attenuation and volumetric backscatter.

Attenuation is the loss of apparent target RCS due to the intervening atmosphere. Atmospheric attenuation applies over the entire radar propagation path, from the radar to the target and back to the radar, or twice the target slant range for a monostatic radar (i.e., one with the transmitter and receiver collocated). Attenuation reduces the range at which a radar can resolve runways from bordering grass areas, due to a reduction in apparent grass clutter RCS and runway clutter RCS.



**Figure 12. Meteorological effects on MMW radar sensors.**

Volumetric reflectivity is the RCS of airborne particles within the radar beam per unit volume. MMW volumetric reflectivity is very low for fog, is relatively low for snow, but can be significant for rain.

### 3.3.3. Test Data Matrix For MMW Sensors

The tower test data matrix for the Honeywell 35 GHz (HI2) and Norden 95 GHz (NS1) radar sensors is presented in Figure 13a, grouped by observed weather conditions, and in Figure 13b, sorted by along-path visibility (LPV) in feet. Although there were several runs with weather conditions of fog, the visibility was usually greater than 1,700 feet (520 m). Conditions of low-visibility fog did not occur at the tower during the sensor test periods. Note that the numbers of measurement runs listed are those that were processed by GTRI from among a larger set that were collected. Table 5 presents a more detailed MMW data matrix for all six sensor configurations tested. The total numbers of runs collected and processed for each sensor configuration are shown, along with the numbers of processed runs sorted by meteorological conditions.




Figure 13a. MMW Test Data Matrix Sorted by Observed Weather.




Figure 13b. MMW Test Data Matrix Sorted by Along-Path Visibility

**Table 5. MMW Radar Sensor Data Matrix**

MMW Sensor Description	Measurements Performed	Total Runs		Number of Runs Processed (by Meteorological Conditions)				
		Collected	Processed	Clear	Snow	Fog	Rain	F&R
Lear development system	sample runs	3	3	3	0	0	0	0
Lear flight system	acceptance test	6	3	3	0	0	0	0
Norden TALONS	full matrix	165	76	4	25	14	33	0
Honeywell development system	sample runs	11	6	6	0	0	0	0
Honeywell flight system	full matrix	46	35	5	3	3	20	4
Honeywell spare unit	sample runs	25	13	2	0	9	2	0

The very late delivery of the 94 GHz sensor to the tower facility precluded testing of the sensor in any conditions other than clear air.

**3.3.4. MMW Sensors Baseline Performance**

Analysis of the performance of the MMW sensors in clear weather established a performance baseline against which the effects of weather could be determined. Baseline measurements also allow comparisons of perceived image quality to the operating parameters of these particular radar sensors. Figure 14 shows how the radar resolution cell sizes at 2 km range compare with the width of the runway at the tower test scene. The radar resolution cell dimensions, downrange and cross-range, are defined by the range and azimuth resolution of the radar sensor, respectively. The fine grid overlay represents the sampling resolution of the data acquisition system (DAS), which in every case exceeded the sensor resolution. DAS oversampling gave a constant data set resolution independent of the MMW sensor under test and provided additional sample points for averaging.




Figure 14. MMW sensor resolution of runway at 2 km range.

Downrange profiles of equivalent received power are a good method of rating a MMW radar sensor's ability to discriminate the runway from the bordering grass areas. As described in Volume 2 (Sensor Tower Testing) of this report, a series of patch areas were defined along the runway and grass for data processing purposes. A downrange power profile plot presents the equivalent received power values from the patches spaced along the grass and runway between 1,700 m and 3,300 m range. Figure 15a is a downrange power profile for the 35 GHz radar, and Figure 15b is the same profile for the Norden 95 GHz radar sensor. Figure 16 is a similar profile for the Lear Astronics 94 GHz radar sensor. Curves have been fit to the points from the grass patches (plus signs) and the runway patches (solid squares). The difference in received power between the grass patches and the runway patches provided by the radar sensor is converted by the signal processor into image contrast. This power difference decreases with range and in weather, reducing the resulting image contrast and the detectability of the runway.




Figure 15a. 35 GHz Downrange Power Profile




Figure 15b. 95 GHz Downrange Power Profile

8/15/92 LA2T06 clear







Figure 16. 94 GHz Downrange Power Profile

### 3.3.5. MMW Radar Tower Test Results

Sufficient MMW sensor data from the Honeywell 35 GHz and Norden 95 GHz radars were collected during the tower tests to report sensor performance results for a variety of weather conditions. Of these two MMW sensors, only the Honeywell 35 GHz radar was designed specifically to perform the runway imaging mission. The Norden 95 GHz radar was not designed for high-resolution runway scene imaging, but it provided valuable test data on the adverse weather.

Results for the Honeywell 35 GHz and Norden 95 GHz radar sensors are summarized in Figure 17 for the three performance categories of contrast, signal-to-variability ratio (SVR), and sharpness. 35 GHz and 95 GHz performance categories are graphed side-by-side for the six weather conditions of clear, medium snow, light fog, very light rain, light rain, and medium rain. These performance values are for runway and grass at 2 km range. The heights of the bars, or relative performance factors, have been normalized to the maximum value measured by these two sensors. No sharpness values could be extracted from the 95 GHz data for the higher rain rates.



**Figure 17. MMW Sensor Performance at 2 km in Clear Air, Fog, Snow, and Rain**

The relative performance advantage of this 35 GHz sensor over the 95 GHz sensor in clear weather is due to the design parameters of these particular radars and not due to any fundamental limitations of the 95 GHz frequency band for runway imaging. The degradation in performance with increasing precipitation for each MMW sensor, relative to its own clear weather performance, does reflect the greater impact of precipitation at 95 GHz.

The numeric values for the MMW performance parameters plotted above are listed in Table 6. Contrast is probably the performance criteria that contributes most to runway detection by a MMW synthetic vision sensor. Fortunately, contrast for the 35 GHz radar was high and remained acceptably high ( $> -0.6$ ) in a rain of 12.9 mm/hr. Contrast for the 95 GHz sensor was acceptable in clear weather but declined more at higher rain rates. SVR at 35 GHz was acceptably high ( $> 5$ ) in clear, snow, and fog, but it dropped dramatically in rain. This would indicate that, although the 35 GHz radar image became "noisy" in rain, the contrast remained acceptable. SVR for the 95 GHz radar was lower, even in clear weather, suggesting that this particular 95 GHz radar was more "noisy" than the 35 GHz radar. 95 GHz SVR also declined in rain conditions, but less so than the 35 GHz radar values. The sharpness values are more difficult to relate to sensor band and meteorological condition, but the 95 GHz radar had higher sharpness. The inconsistencies in reported sharpness suggest that the method used to measure sharpness does not provide a reliable performance criteria.

**Table 6. MMW Performance Summary At 2 Km Range**

<b>Meteorological Condition</b>	<b>Freq (GHz)</b>	<b>Contrast</b>	<b>SVR</b>	<b>Sharpness (deg<sup>-1</sup>)</b>
Clear (Baseline)	35	high (-0.98)	high (6.9)	high (3.3)
	95	high (-0.64)	medium (1.8)	medium (1.78)
Snow	35	high (-0.99)	high (8.6)	medium (2.0)
	95	medium (-0.67)	medium (1.8)	high (5.33)
Fog	35	high (-0.99)	high (7.9)	medium (2.0)
	95	medium (-0.55)	medium (1.6)	high (3.33)
Rain (1.2 mm/hr)	35	high (-0.81)	medium (2.3)	medium (1.7)
	95	low (-0.33)	medium (1.5)	high (4.44)
Rain (5.3 mm/hr)	35	high (-0.95)	medium (3.62)	medium (1.8)
Rain (8.8 mm/hr)	95	low (-0.23)	low (0.7)	not measurable
Rain (12.9 mm/hr)	35	medium (-0.65)	low (1.22)	medium (1.7)
Rain (20.0 mm/hr)	95	low (-0.03)	low (1.08)	not measurable

**3.3.6. Infrared Sensor Test Data Matrix**

Baseline data were collected with the Kodak IR camera system on two occasions. The images were collected over a 24 hour period with nominally clear weather for both collection periods. IR data in low visibility conditions were collected on four separate dates. The low visibility weather conditions were nominally identified as rain with accompanying fog. The visibility on those data collection periods ranged from less than a kilometer to nearly 28 kilometers. Tables 7 and 8 summarize the IR data collected and analyzed.

**Table 7. IR Image Data Collected At WPAFB 03/13/92 Through 05/28/92**

	Date Collected	Number of Images
Baseline Diurnal	03/12/92	41
Fog / Rain	03/18/92	9
Fog / Rain	03/30/92	16
Fog / Rain	04/18/92	7
Fog / Rain	04/21/92	8
Baseline Diurnal	05/27/92	33
Total Number of Images		114

**Table 8. IR Image Data Analyzed**

		Number Images Analyzed	Number with Runway Measurable
Baseline Diurnal	(03/13/92)	41	41
Fog/Rain	(03/18/92)	9	9
Fog/Rain	(03/30/92)	16	7
Fog/Rain	(04/18/92)	6	6
Fog/Rain	(04/21/92)	6	4
Baseline Diurnal	(05/27/92)	11	11
TOTALS		89	78
Total Number of Runway Radiance Measurements from Images			235

**3.3.7. Infrared Sensor Baseline Performance**

The contrast available in IR images collected during clear weather was observed to mirror the temporal variations in surface temperatures during the diurnal periods in which

measurements were made, except at particular times of day when the sun was positioned to reflect from the runway surface into the camera field of view. The measured contrast was low during the night and reached maximum levels in mid afternoon, varying in a manner similar to the behavior of measured surface temperature differences. The solar reflection from the runway generated a sharply peaked maximum in the late afternoon, corresponding to the time of alignment of the sun with the reflected line of sight from the tower. These observations prompt the conclusion that the ground surface temperature differences are the primary influence on IR image contrast collected in clear weather with a platinum silicide (PtSi) camera operating in the 3 to 5 micron band, and that reflections of illuminating radiation from the sun are only important when the solar alignment is near the specularly reflected line of sight. The weather conditions required to produce thermal reversal of the runway and the grass background did not appear to exist on the dates on which baseline performance data was taken.

Sharpness measured in cross-runway profiles showed transitions covering from one to three pixel spacing with no obvious systematic effects related to range, visibility, time of day, or other weather condition. The mean transition zone was observed to be 0.16 degrees wide.

### **3.3.8. Infrared Sensor Performance in Fog, Snow and Rain**

Low visibility conditions of fog, snow, and rain imposed significant reductions in runway visibility. It was not possible to detect the runway in IR image data collected in rain or fog when the measured visibility was less than one mile.

The IR contrast is reduced in precipitation conditions, principally because the temperature differences are reduced. IR contrast was also affected to some degree by attenuation along the path through the atmosphere, but the relative importance of atmospheric attenuation was difficult to determine because of the small temperature differences observed.

The fog drop size distributions in those cases where measurements were available implied that the "fog" was very light and was composed of relatively small particles with diameters less than 5 microns. Fog is generally identified with droplet diameters from 5 to 40 microns.<sup>1</sup>

The extinction inferred from the measured visibility for the low visibility conditions was generally lower than for clear weather, but the visibility was not always low enough to indicate significant amounts of fog. The extinction calculated from rain and fog drop size distributions

---

<sup>1</sup>Dennis, Richard, Handbook on Aerosols, U.S. Dept. of Energy, NTIS # TID-26608, January 1976, p.3.

shows that the measured optical visibility is reduced primarily due to raindrop extinction and that the extinction due to fog particles is very small in all of the cases for which particle size data were available.

### **3.3.8. Conclusions Regarding SVS Sensor Tower Tests**

#### **3.3.8.1 MMW Sensors**

All six of the MMW sensors tested at the tower facility were capable of imaging the airport runway scene in clear weather conditions. There were significant differences in the MMW imaging sensors' angular resolution, runway-to-grass contrast, signal-to-noise ratio, and maximum runway detection range. As would be expected from antenna theory, the 95 GHz radar sensors have more than twice the angular resolution of the 35 GHz radars for the same 30 inch antenna aperture. The differences in MMW radar RCS between the runway pavement and bordering grass areas at the 2° to 3° incident angle are about 16 to 22 dB. Resolution limitations of the MMW sensors prevented them from fully converting this RCS difference into image contrast. The 94-95 GHz radar sensors tested lacked the performance to image the runway out to the end at 3,300 m range. The 35 GHz radars exhibited higher signal-to-noise ratio, and were able to image the runway to 3,300 m range.

Meteorological effects of fog, snow, and rain decreased the maximum runway detection range for the MMW sensors by varying degrees. The MMW detection range was not significantly reduced by the snowfall and fog conditions that occurred during the tests. More MMW tower test data are needed in fogs of less than one mile visibility to establish any performance limitations due to fog. Rainfall rates as low as 2 mm/hr reduced the MMW detection ranges, especially for 95 GHz. Runway detection by the 35 GHz radars was seriously degraded for rainfall rates greater than 20 mm/hr. As was predicted from MMW propagation theory, the dominant effect of rain on image quality at ranges of 2 to 4 km is signal attenuation. The 35 GHz radar sensor tested provided the best runway detection performance in clear and adverse weather conditions with airport scene resolution adequate for the pilots' management of flight path to the runway.

#### **3.3.8.2. Infrared Sensors**

The dependence of IR contrast on ground surface temperature differences implies the dominance of the IR radiation emitted by the scene components which is a function of surface temperature and the emissivity of surface materials. Reflection of sources of illumination are important only for the solar disk and only at times when the sun is properly positioned. The

cyclic diurnal behavior is derived from solar heating of the ground which reaches its maximum in early afternoon, and which is replaced at night by the cooling effects of radiation from the ground to the cold sky. Other observers have reported cases of the grass background being warmer than the concrete runway at some times of day so that the computed contrast is a negative value. Thermal reversal was observed during measurements under low visibility conditions.

Definitive conclusions as to IR sensor system performance in fog are not possible due to the lack of cases of thick fog during the period of tower testing causing significant obscuration of the runway. The measured PtSi IR sensor performance data are consistent, however, with the performance estimates derived in the sensor performance modeling work of this Program. There is no way to directly compare the IR system quantitatively with visible wavelength sensors, since comparison data in the visible band were not collected, but the PtSi IR sensor operating in the 3 to 5 micron IR band showed no obvious improvement over the visible band under the conditions encountered during these tests. This is in agreement with performance estimates based on drop size distributions representative of typical fog types.

#### **3.4. EXPERIMENTAL SYSTEM INTEGRATION, EVALUATION AND DEMONSTRATION (SIED)**

The objectives of the SIED task were to implement, demonstrate and document the capabilities of an experimental synthetic vision system using existing technologies on-board an executive class transport aircraft. MMW and FLIR sensor data were to be collected, along with measured weather data, aircraft performance data and pilot performance data for analyses and documentation. This was to be accomplished under varying weather conditions and at a variety of airports for approach, landing and ground operations. Specific test objectives were identified as follows:

- Empirically measure the achieved performance of the integrated pilot/synthetic vision system during low visibility operations.
- Assess the pilots capabilities and workload when using the functional prototype synthetic vision system.
- Determine the operational characteristics of the imaging sensor used in the functional prototype synthetic vision system in terms of the airport environment and actual weather encountered.
  - Measure the physical phenomena of millimeter wavelength radar imaging of airport scenes at low visibilities.

- Measure performance of the millimeter wavelength radar and its image processing under operational conditions.
- Measure performance of the forward looking infra-red sensor under operational conditions.
- Measure the actual weather conditions that the aircraft encounters when measuring the above phenomena and sensor performance.
- Determine, document, and correlate the actual weather conditions existing between the aircraft and the runway for all approaches in actual weather.
- Determine the image quality in a manner that can be correlated to achieved performance and is transferable to future synthetic vision systems.

Figure 18 illustrates the operational approach used in making the evaluation measurements listed above. They included :

- Manually flown precision approaches through the end of roll out or missed approach point.
- Manually flown non-precision approaches with a no-navaid final segment.
- Ground operations including taxi, roll out and takeoff.

# EXPERIMENTAL SYNTHETIC VISION SYSTEM LOW VISIBILITY APPROACHES

**OBJECTIVE:**

- Measured Synthetic Vision System and Sensor Performance in Low Visibility Conditions with Pilot in Loop

**ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Type 1 ILS Facility
- Glide Slope Coverage Confirmed per Flight Inspection Records
- Barometric Altimeter Calibration at Threshold Prior to Flight And Correlated with RDR Altimeter
- Ground ILS Protection Zone Security
- Transmissometer Data Accurate to 600' RVR
- or
- 2-Way Radio With Wx Observer Near Runway
- Minimum RVR of 700'

**Missed Approach**

- ILS Instrument Procedures
- Decision to Land
- Visual Procedures 50'




Figure 18. Flight Test Methodology

**Major Milestones.** The following major milestones were established and accomplished during the System Integration, Evaluation and Demonstration task:

<b>Program Milestones</b>	
<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Date</b>
Task Accomplishment Plan	April 1991
Head-up Display Selection	April 1991
Radome Specification	May 1991
Experimental SVS Requirements Study	June 1991
Simulation Requirements	June 1991
Aircraft Selection	July 1991
Preliminary Design Review	July 1991
Critical Design Review	Nov/Dec 1991
Program Plan	February 1992
35 GHz. Radome Available	February 1992
Hot Bench Integration and Test	February 1992
Flight Test Plan	March 1992
Safety Plan	March 1992
FAA Experimental Certificate	March 1992
Flight Readiness Review No. 1	April 1992
Suitability Flights (35 GHz.)	May 1992
Evaluation Flights (35 GHz.)	July 1992
Flight Readiness Review No. 2	August 1992
FAA Waiver To CAT IIIa	August 1992
Suitability Flights (94 GHz.)	October 1992
Continue Eval. Flights (35 GHz.)	November 1992
Final CIST conference Meeting	January 1993
Final Report	February 1993

### **3.4.1. Description Of Experimental System**

The experimental Synthetic Vision System consisted of 1) MMW and FLIR Sensors, 2) Head Up Display, 3) Weather Acquisition Sensors, 4) Aircraft, and 5) Data Acquisition System. The experimental system incorporated all the functions in prototype form necessary to support the variety of operational approach and landing procedures to be demonstrated and evaluated. The system was often referred to as the Functional Prototype Synthetic Vision System (FPSVS)

### **3.4.1.1. Sensors**

The experimental system used three sensors; the Honeywell 35 GHz MMW Sensor, the Lear 94 GHz MMW Sensor, and the Kodak 3-5 micron FLIR. These sensors provided an opportunity to examine a wide range of sensor technology.

#### **3.4.1.1.1. Primary MMW Sensor**

Described briefly earlier in this Executive Summary, in the overview of sensor tower testing, the 35 GHz sensor system was developed for this SVS Technology Demonstration Program by the Honeywell System Research Center using an existing receiver /transmitter unit developed several years earlier for another application. An electro-mechanical scanning antenna was developed specifically for the SVS application by Malibu Research Associates under contract to Honeywell. An illustration of the installation of this sensor in the radome of the flight test aircraft is provided in Figure 19.

A shaped reflector was used to achieve a vertical fan-beam pattern of approximately 26 degrees with cosecant squared rolloff, and an azimuthal beamwidth of 0.7 degrees. Based on an "Eagle Scanner" technique, a dielectric slug was used to change the phase velocity of the waveguide feed, scanning 30 degrees in the horizontal plane at approximately 10 Hz . An image processor performed the trigonometric conversion from range-azimuth to elevation-azimuth to produce the conformal image. Conformality was also maintained during platform motion. Platform altitude, pitch, and roll information were required by the processor to perform the conversion and stabilization.

## 35 GHz MMW Sensor Arrangement





Figure 19. 35 GHz Sensor Installation in Test Aircraft

### 3.4.1.1.2. Backup MMW Sensor

The Lear Astronics 94 GHz MMW sensor system was built specifically for the SVS Technology Demonstration Program. Because of delays in its development and acceptance testing resulting in late availability to the SIED effort, this sensor became the backup to the 35 GHz sensor system. An illustration of the installation of this sensor in the test aircraft is provided in Figure 20.

The Lear Astronics sensor produced a conformal "C-scope" image based on reflected 94 GHz power. Range data was obtained by using the chirped frequency. The sensor used a narrow vertical fan beam antenna in which range data was obtained for a given horizontal position. The fan beam was mechanically swept horizontally to fill in the remaining azimuth locations. Designed and constructed for Lear Astronics by Malibu Research Associates, the antenna incorporated pitch stabilization enabling the antenna to maintain the correct pointing angle down the glidepath aimed at the touchdown point during an established approach.

## 94 GHz MMW Sensor Arrangement



**Figure 20. 94 GHz Sensor Installation in Test Aircraft**

An image processor performed the trigonometric conversion from range-azimuth to elevation-azimuth to produce the conformal image. Conformality was also maintained during platform motion. Platform altitude, pitch, and roll were required by the processor to perform the conversion and stabilization.

### **3.4.1.1.3. 3-5 Micron Forward Looking Infrared (FLIR) Sensor**

A Kodak FLIR Camera, model KIR-310 series 200, was used to produce an IR image. This sensor was also designed as a part of the competitive design study carried out separately from the SIED Task. This design was then built by Kodak for another customer and for other purposes but was subsequently provided by Kodak for use in the SIED Task. The location of this sensor in the radome of the test aircraft can be seen in Figures 19 and 20.


The sensor used a platinum silicide staring array, which was sensitive in the 1-6 micron wavelength range. An internal bandpass filter limited operation to the 3-5 micron range. The array had excellent resolution, 640 x 486 pixels, and very good thermal performance.

The FLIR contained both a manual mode, requiring a dedicated human to constantly optimize the settings, and an auto brightness and contrast mode for hands-off operation. This automatic feature was very important when operating under varying dynamic conditions, approach, touchdown and taxi. The platinum silicide detector provided 12 bits of dynamic range. The auto brightness/contrast histogrammed the pixels in the scene and set the 8 bit RS-170 (video) levels appropriately. The net result was very good hands off operation under a variety of conditions.


#### **3.4.1.2. Head Up Display**

The GEC Avionics HUD projected both stroke symbology and a raster image on to a combining glass placed between the pilot's eyes and the windsreen. A photograph of the installation of the HUD in the test aircraft is provided in Figure 21. Symbols were produced by controlling the X-Y deflection coils during the fly back time of the raster image. This resulted in very bright crisp symbols, overlaid upon "normal" TV raster image. Symbol generation was based upon data from existing on-board avionics. A computer received, interpreted, and generated text and symbols (i.e.. text - airspeed, ground speed, Barometric Alt, Radar Alt,... symbols - heading tape, pitch ladder, flight director, flare guidance cue, ..) The HUD also produced a RS-170 combined symbology image signal. This signal was used to drive the central HDD video display and was recorded on the data acquisition VCR.

An illustration of the stroke symbology used on the GEC head-up display (HUD) is shown in Figure 22. The symbol layout was patterned after that used on a HUD manufactured by Flight Dynamics, Inc. (FDI). That HUD is currently certified for Cat IIIa approaches in a Boeing 727 aircraft to runways with Cat IIIa equipment (3 transmissometers, a Type II ILS, and an ALSF approach lighting system with touchdown zone and centerline lights). The FDI HUD has been successfully used in Cat IIIa conditions by Alaska Airlines for several years. The symbology layout was used in this program because it was a known reference . The concept was to start from this reference and add the synthetic vision image, varying from the established layout only as required for the SIED Task. The symbols in Figure 22 depart from the certified symbol set



**Figure 21. GEC Head-Up Display Installation in SVS Test Aircraft**



**Figure 22. Head-Up Display Symbology Used in SVS Test Aircraft**

based on recommendations from an SAE subcommittee on HUD symbology, and on opinions of engineers at GEC.

The flight director guidance laws were developed by Hoh Aeronautics, Inc., under contract to TRW. These control laws were adequate to accomplish the approach task in significant winds and wind shear and provide flare guidance that was considered adequate by the pilots. However, the laws would have to be further refined before they could be certified for flight in all operational conditions, especially for the localizer and glideslope capture functions.

#### 3.4.1.3. Weather Sensors

The aircraft was equipped with three weather sensors; two wing mounted probes and one fuselage mounted probe. The wing mounted pods could carry interchangeable particle measurement laser probes. The fuselage probe measured liquid water content. The laser probes

available covered a wide range of particle sizes including those of water droplets found in fog, cloud and precipitation. One configuration of the wing mounted laser probes can be seen in Figure 23. The raw data was sent to a computer, where it was recorded on a digital tape. The computer also interpreted and printed a real time snapshot of the collected data. Airspeed, temperature, and static and pitot pressures were also recorded for later use in further reduction and analyses of the weather data.

#### 3.4.1.4. SVS Test Aircraft

A Gulfstream-II business class jet, tail number N65ST, was used as the flying platform. A photograph of the test aircraft is provided in Figure 24 complete with the modifications made to support the experimental SVS equipment.. The aircraft was flown in the Experimental category.

##### 3.4.1.4.1 Part 91 Avionics


The aircraft avionics complement of the test aircraft is described in Table 9. The existing avionics package provided the safety pilot (left seat) with standard part 91 equipment.

**Table 9. Aircraft Avionics**

1	Weather Radar System; one Honeywell WC-650 (15" antenna)
2	Electronic Flight Instrument System; one Honeywell 5 tube EFIS
3	Air Data Computer System; one Honeywell AZ-800
4	Altimeter Indicators
5	Vertical Speed Indicators
6	VHF Communications System; triple Collins VHF-20
7	HF Radio; two King KHF-950 w/ Motorola NA-135 SELCAL
8	VHF Navigation System, two Collins VIR-30
9	Avionics Power Switching
10	Inertial Navigation System; two Litton LTN-92
11	VLF/Omega; one Universal UNS-1Jr
12	Distance Measurement Equipment System; one Collins DME-42 and one DME-40
13	Automatic Direction Finder System; two Collins ADF-60A
14	Flight Director System; two Honeywell FZ-500
15	Transponders; two Collins TDR-90
16	Radio Altimeter System, one Collins ALT-55B
17	Cockpit Voice Recorder; Fairchild A-100
18	Flight Phone; Wolfsberg Flitefone VI
19	Angle of Attack; Teledyne AOA
20	GPS; Marconi



**Figure 23. Precipitation Measurement Probe Mounted On SVS Test Aircraft**



**Figure 24. SVS Test Aircraft**

### 3.4.1.4.2. Special SVS Aircraft Features

The aircraft was modified to accommodate the following features designed specifically for the SVS Functional Prototype System (FPSVS):

**Special Antennas** The MMW and FLIR sensors required more space than was originally available. Several modifications had to be performed to the nose area. The ILS glideslope antenna was replaced with a conformal antenna and relocated at the bottom of the radome., the ILS localizer antenna was relocated to the fuselage, and the existing 15" Weather Radar Antenna was replaced with a smaller 12" model and moved up. An external VHF Communications antenna was added to the rear bottom of the fuselage. The antenna was connected to a portable hand held radio located

in the cabin at the Test Directors Work Station The radio was operated in the cabin by the Test Engineer. Antenna Specifications can be found in appendix C VHF Communication Antenna.

**Yoke Position Transducers.** Position transducers were added to the test pilot's yoke (right seat). The transducers (pitch and roll) was designed to provide a resistance which was linearly proportional to the yoke position. This position data was recorded by the Data Acquisition System (DAS).

**Sensor Selector.** A left thumb switch was placed on the right seat yoke. The push button switch was used by the pilot to rotate between the MMW image, FLIR image, and no image on the HUD.

**Event Marker.** A right thumb switch was placed on the right seat yoke. The thumb switch was used by the pilot to record an Event Mark on the Data Acquisition System.

**Dual-Circuit Intercom.** The existing aircraft intercom and Public Address System was enhanced with a second cabin intercom loop. The enhanced intercom system provided each of the FPSVS Engineering crew (Test Director, Test Engineer, MMW Sensor Engineer, Host/Wx, and Observers (Qty 4)) with a headset and microphone. The intercom was based on a "Hot" Microphone. For safety, the installation was designed so that the pilot/copilot was able to address the support crew over the existing PA system. Three audio outputs were routed to the DAS for audio recording.

**Radome Air Purge.** Pressurized dry cabin air was vented into the radome . The cabin air reduced the moisture content within the radome. The purpose of the vent was to prevent condensation on the FLIR window, waveguides, and the non-sealed FPSVS components. The vent remained open for altitudes below 10,000 feet.

**Power Converters/Inverters** The aircraft contained special power generators, converters/inverters, and transformer rectifiers. The Power Supplies provided clean regulated power to the FPSVS equipment.

**Circuit Breakers** The FPSVS Equipment contain a hierarchical 2-level circuit breaker system. The first level was located in the rear baggage compartment of the aircraft. This panel contained individual circuit breakers for each rack, and each type of power within each rack. These circuit breakers were rated slightly above the maximum required current. The next level

circuit breakers were at the back of each rack. These breakers were rated at a higher current level but had a faster response time (short circuit protection).

**External Ground Power.** Provisions were made to use an external AC power cart. The ground cart provided 3 phase 115 VAC 400 Hz power to the FPSVS.

**Monitor Points.** Electronic interfaces to the existing aircraft avionics were installed and connectorized. This permitted connections to be made easily between the FPSVS and the avionics. These connectors also permitted the Hot Bench computer to bypass the aircraft avionics and emulate all the required signals for the FPSVS.

**Sensor Mounting Bracket.** A "Universal" Mounting bracket was installed on the forward bulkhead located within the radome space. Special signature brackets were designed for the Honeywell Sensor, Lear Sensor, and Kodak Sensor. The signature brackets held each sensor, and mounted directly to the universal bracket.

**HUD Combiner Camera.** A HUD Combiner video camera was developed to record the HUD Combiner image (as seen by the pilot). The camera was located between the combiner glass and the pilot's eye. As such the camera was able to see the HUD image and the outside world. This camera was used to record contrast shifts (due to ambient light), runway edge problems and image registration with the outside world.

**Glareshield Camera.** A glareshield video camera was mounted to provide an out the window view of the approaches and taxi. The color camera provided a real-time image of the approach. The image was available to the cabin monitors and was recorded on the VCR.

**Equipment Racks.** Nine 5 foot high 19" equipment racks were installed in the aircraft. to hold the experimental SVS equipment and data monitoring and acquisition equipment.

**Head Up Display.** The HUD Overhead Unit was mounted above the right seat. A second tray was installed above the left seat (transfer between the trays required approximately 10 minutes).

**Head Down Display.** A Head Down Display was centrally installed on the cockpit panel. The display was mounted in place of the center tube of a 5-tube Honeywell EFIS system.

**Wing Mounted Weather Pods.** The aircraft was required to carry two weather probe pods in a free air stream. The two interchangeable pods, provided by Particle Measurement Systems, were mounted on each wing. Each pod was held stable beneath the wing using dedicated pylons. These pylons were designed to carry a single pod each of approximately 45 lbs at a maximum aircraft speed. The pylon was designed to allow a quick removal and installation of the pod.

### 3.4.1.5. Data Acquisition System

The Data Acquisition System (DAS) was designed to record and reduce flight data for the evaluation flight test. The recorded information consisted of aircraft avionics, video, internal MMW, and weather parameters. There were four major airborne acquisition categories and three major ground analysis categories. The responsibilities for each of the four data acquisition systems is outlined below:

<b>Location</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<b>Airborne (Acquisition)</b>	<b>System Data</b>	<b>TRW</b>
	<b>Weather</b>	<b>JTD</b>
	<b>MMW (Primary)</b>	<b>Honeywell</b>
	<b>MMW (Secondary)</b>	<b>Lear</b>
<b>Ground (Reduction/Analysis)</b>	<b>System Data</b>	<b>TRW</b>
	<b>Weather</b>	<b>JTD</b>
	<b>MMW (both)</b>	<b>GTRI</b>

### 3.4.2. Description of Primary Test Airports

A description of the primary airports used during the testing is provided in Table 10. With the exception of San Diego, all of the runways were surrounded by grass. In some cases, the primary runway surface had a different texture than the sides, where the runway lights were installed. For example, Los Angeles had a concrete runway with asphalt sides. In other cases, the sides of the asphalt runway were also asphalt, but the surface was not as well maintained as the runway itself, and had a rough appearance.

### 3.4.3. Ground-Based Simulation

A fixed-base simulation of the synthetic vision HUD display was developed by the Douglas Aircraft Company under contract to TRW. An existing MD-11 cockpit and math model was used as a starting point. A GEC HUD was installed in the cockpit in a configuration identical to that of the G-II flight test aircraft. This HUD was capable of providing superimposed stroke and raster information. The software supplied by GEC for the HUD was identical to that used in the flight test. The raster display on the HUD was capable of simulating a FLIR scene and a MMW scene. Since these were developed before the flight testing it was necessary to estimate the FLIR and MMW sensor performance characteristics. All the evaluation pilots agreed that the raster scene displayed during the simulation was reasonably representative of the results obtained during the

Table 10. Description of Primary Test Airports

Airport	Identifier	Runway Heading (mag)	Approach Lights	Centerline Lights	Touchdown Zone Lights	Runway Lights	Trans-missometer	Surface	TDZ Elevation	Length	Width	Approach	DH or MDA	Minimums
Arcata	ACV	316.0	SSALR	Yes	Yes	HIRL	2	Asph-p/c	218	5,998	150	ILS	200	1800 R
Atlantic City	ACY	129.6	SSALR	No	No	HIRL	3	Asph - grooved	76	10,000	180	ILS	200	1800 R
Colorado Spring	COB	349.2	ALSF-1	No	No	HIRL	None	Asph-p/c	6075	11,021	150	ILS	200	1/2 mile
Palomar	CRQ	243.0	MALSR	No	No	HIRL	None	Asph - p/c	323	4,700	150	ILS	200	1/2 mile
Huntington	HTS	316.0	MALSR	No	No	HIRL	None	Asph-grooved	828	6,509	150	ILS	200	3/4 mile
Los Angeles	LAX	249.1	MALSR	Yes	Yes	HIRL	3	Concrete-grooved	121	10,285	150	ILS	200	1800 R
Lompoc	LPT	77.5	ALSF-1	No	No	HIRL	None	Asph	9	10,000	150	ILS	200	1/2 mile
Milville	MIV	100.0	MALSR	No	No	HIRL	None	Concrete	74	6,000	150	ILS	200	1/2 mile
Petuxes River	PHK	59.3	ALSF-1	No	No	HIRL	None	Concrete	40	11,800	200	OCA	200	1/2 mile
Pl. Mugu	NTD	209.0	MALSR	No	No	HIRL	None	Asph	12	11,100	200	ILS	200	1/2 mile
Pueblo	PUB	77.6	SSALR	No	No	HIRL	None	Asph-p/c	4668	10,496	150	ILS	200	1/2 mile
Worcester	ORH	109.1	MALSR	No	No	HIRL	None	Asph	981	6,999	150	ILS	200	1/2 mile
San Diego	SAN	272.5	MALSF	No	No	HIRL	1	Concrete-grooved	14	9,400	200	LOC	646	5000 R
Santa Maria	SMX	121.1	MALSR	No	No	HIRL	None	Asph - p/c	237	6,300	150	ILS	200	1/2 mile
Santa Barbara	SBA	74.3	MALSR	No	No	HIRL	1	Asph-grooved	10	6,049	150	ILS	200	2400 R
Vandenberg	VBO	301.7	ALSF-2	No	No	HIRL	None	Concrete	367	15,000	200	ILS	200	1/2 mile
Van Nuys	VNY	161.5	MALSR	No	No	HIRL	None	Asph	790	6580	150	ILS	250	3/4 mile

subsequent flight testing. The MD-11 approach pitch attitude was found to be considerably higher than the G-II. This was compensated for by using a higher approach airspeed, and conducting all approaches in a 25-knot headwind.

The simulation included a Redifon camera-model type Visual Flight Attachment (VFA). The model runway was 10,400 feet long, 200 feet wide and included approach lights, strobes, runway end markers, threshold bars, touchdown zone, VASI, edge lights, and centerline lights. This VFA system was capable of simulating varying runway visual range and ceilings. It was set up to perform approach, landing and takeoff operations in Cat I, Cat II, Cat IIIa, and Cat IIIc conditions. Steady winds, wind-shears, crosswinds, and turbulence were simulated to assist in the development and evaluation of the flight director laws and to provide pilot training for the flight test program. The cockpit was configured like an MD-11 with six across 8x8 inch fully operational CRT displays. The Electronic Display formats were modeled after the MD-11. The MD-11 autopilot was operational, and was frequently used for demonstration flights.

The objectives of the simulation were to:

- Evaluate and refine the HUD symbology and flight director guidance laws
- Familiarize the evaluation pilots with the HUD symbology and SVS procedures. Also develop SVS procedures where necessary
- Provide familiarization for demonstration pilots

Some changes were made to the HUD symbology as a result of the initial evaluations by the evaluation pilots. The primary change was in the flight director guidance laws. These were modified considerably from the initial configuration, and the simulation was used extensively to accomplish the necessary fine tuning. Even though the laws were tuned for the MD-11 aerodynamics, they were found to work acceptably well on the G-II without modification.

A number of demonstration flights were made to key members of government and industry. In most cases, the demonstration pilots were given a simulation session to gain familiarity with the HUD symbology.

### 3.4.4. Test Plan and Priorities

The detailed test plan used to guide the flight testing is included in Volume 4 of this report. The waiver issued to the project by the FAA to permit descents to below CAT I minimums is also included in Volume 4. The five selected airports were Arcata, Santa Maria, Vandenberg AFB, Santa Barbara, and Point Mugu NAS, all in California. The test aircraft was operated out of Van Nuys, California within a reasonable flying time of the five approved airports. A list of prioritized test objectives from the test plan is given in Table 11, along with what was done to accomplish the objectives. The test objective priorities were established by the test team based on inputs from the Certification Issues Study Team.

**Table 11. Summary of Project Objectives and Accomplishments**

Priority	Objective	Accomplishment
1	Low visibility approaches to Cat IIIa minimums in actual Cat IIIa conditions.	37 approaches in actual Cat IIIa conditions of which 12 were to Cat IIIa minimums. Some approaches were not conducted to the Cat IIIa DH because the airport was not included in the waiver, or because the waiver had not yet been issued
2	Accomplish the above approaches in different types of fog	Approaches were made in coastal fog (Arcata, Santa Maria, and Vandenberg), in valley fog (Huntington WV), and in frontal fog (Worcester, MA).
3	Conduct approaches in rain with varying rain-rates	Approaches were made to five different airports in rain with rain-rates varying from 0.50 to 22 mm/hr.
4	Conduct approaches to different types of airport surfaces	Approaches were made to 27 different airports. Formal evaluations were made during approaches to 17 of these airports.
5	Conduct landings in simulated Cat IIIc conditions (i.e., simulated O/O)	All three evaluation pilots successfully accomplished three simulated O/O landings and roll-outs. Simulated O/O takeoffs were also accomplished
6	Test ability to identify runway incursions using the MMW sensors	Six runs were made in simulated IMC conditions where runway and taxi way incursions were staged. The evaluation pilot did not know in advance when these incursions were to be staged
7	Test a second MMW radar at 94 GHz	The Lear 94 GHz MMW radar was installed, checked out, and 11 final suitability runs were made
8	Test an infrared sensor in actual weather	A Kodak 3-5 micron FLIR was installed and was operational in all actual weather runs.
9	Conduct approaches in snow conditions	Approaches were made to Pueblo Colorado in falling snow, with 1 to 2 inches of wet snow on the runway, and to Pueblo and Colorado Springs to a plowed runway
10	Test ability to conduct non-precision approaches to simulated Cat IIa minimums	Localizer approaches and no-navaid-final-segment approaches were flown to simulated Cat IIIa conditions

IMC conditions were simulated by inserting a cardboard shield between the HUD and windscreen. The shield was held in place with Velcro tape, and was removed by the Test Director at the appropriate decision height. In the case of simulated Cat IIIc (0/0) landings, the shield was not removed throughout the approach, landing, and rollout. The safety pilot typically took over control of the aircraft below 60 knots as he had control of the nosewheel steering. For some runs, the shield was removed at 50 feet altitude to simulate Cat IIIa, and was reinserted during the rollout to simulate a surprise fog bank encounter.

#### **3.4.5. Evaluation Pilots**

Three evaluation pilots participated in the flight test program for purposes of taking data. The pilots were carefully selected so as to bring to the tests a cross section of experience including extensive airline experience, military transport, fighter, and helicopter experience, FAA certification experience, and professional flight test backgrounds that included use of head-up displays. All three of the pilots were type rated in a number of transport category aircraft. Two of the pilots were Douglas Aircraft Company experimental flight test pilots and participated as part of their employment by Douglas; a third pilot was an FAA experimental flight test pilot and certification pilot who participated as part of his responsibilities to the FAA Transport Aircraft Certification Directorate.

Training for the evaluations in the G-II aircraft was accomplished in two phases. First, all of the evaluation pilots attended simulation and ground training to qualify as second-in-command in the G-II aircraft at Simuflight in Dallas Texas. Second, a fixed-base simulator was modified by Douglas Aircraft to include the GEC HUD used for the SVS program. Models of the millimeter-wave radar and forward looking infrared sensors were included in the simulation, and were superimposed on the stroke symbology on the HUD. The simulation was used to optimize the HUD symbology, refine the flight director control laws, and to accomplish pilot training.

### **3.4.6. SVS Instrument Approach Procedures**

For the most part, the instrument approach procedures used in the flight tests were conventional. Specialized procedures were employed to ensure safety, and to obtain data. The evaluation pilot was required to make three callouts unique to the SVS program.

- **Radar Image** - This callout indicated that the pilot could see a pattern on the HUD that signified that the radar was imaging the ground
- **Runway Image** - This was a highly significant call. It indicated that the evaluation pilot had an image of the landing runway, and that the quality of the image was sufficiently good to continue below Cat I minimums on a Type 1 beam, with no transmissometers (RVR data), and no touchdown zone or centerline lights. The safety pilot was required to execute a missed-approach if he did not hear the "runway image" call before reaching the published decision-height for the approach.
- **Visual-Land** - This was also a highly significant call in that it indicated that the pilot had a view of the runway environment that was sufficient to continue to landing without synthetic vision. The safety pilot was required to execute a missed approach if he did not hear the "visual land" call above the SVS DH for the five airports on the waiver, and the published DH for all other airports. The SVS DH was always 50 feet.

In addition to the above calls, the Test Director was required to monitor the radar and barometric altimeters approaching the Cat I decision-height. If the radar altimeter indicated the proper trends approaching DH, the test director called "altimeters verified". The safety pilot was required to execute a missed approach if he did not hear this call for approaches in weather below Cat I minimums. The purpose of this procedure was to limit the exposure time over which the single radar altimeter could fail with significant consequences. The probability of such a failure was calculated to be less than  $10^{-6}$ , a value felt to be adequate for the test environment by the flight safety review board.

Three types of approaches were made during the flight test program; the normal ILS, a non-precision localizer approach, and a no-navaid-final-segment approach. These are illustrated in Figure 24. For the ILS approaches, the evaluation pilot tracked the flight director down to the Cat IIIa decision-height of 50 feet. The image was primarily used to monitor the approach, although it was common for the evaluation pilot to use the image for runway alignment when the integrity of the localizer was questionable. For the non-precision localizer approach, the normal procedure was used for the descent to the minimum descent altitude (MDA). A descent below the MDA was initiated after the pilot made the "runway image" call. Lateral control was identical to the ILS whereas longitudinal flight path control depended on the image and the HUD symbology. The flight director guidance cue was in a mode to provide only altitude hold or

vertical speed hold for non-precision approaches, and the raw-data glideslope information was not displayed on the HUD. The no-navaid-final-segment approach was conducted in an identical fashion to the localizer approach except that the test director detuned the ILS localizer frequency after hearing the pilot call "runway image". This required the evaluation pilot to rely only on the HUD image and symbology (without flight director or ILS guidance) for guidance. The safety pilot always had full ILS glideslope and localizer information on his displays. For most simulated IMC approaches the cardboard shield was in place in front of the HUD down to an altitude of 50 feet. A few ILS approaches were conducted to Cat IIIc (0/0) minimums, and a few were conducted to Cat II (100 ft DH) minimums.




Figure 25. Approach Procedures Used in Flight Test Program

### **3.4.7. Sensor Performance In Flight**

An assessment of the performance of the sensors was conducted by GTRI as a part of the SEID Task. This assessment was performed primarily to establish a clear understanding of the contributions of the sensors to the image used by the pilots and to the overall system performance.

#### **3.4.7.1. Radar Sensor Performance Characteristics Measured In Flight**

In performing this assessment, GTRI used many of the same techniques for characterizing the performance of the sensors that were developed in the tower test of the sensors. Also, in many areas, the analyses of the performance of the sensors incorporates information gained in the complementary studies performed in the tower facility.

Figure 26, an illustration of radar phenomenology used previously in this report in the discussion of testing of the SVS sensors in the tower facility, is used again to illustrate a hypothetical runway surface and the surrounding terrain as a radar might view them.

Figure 27 illustrates the radar signature expected for the runway-terrain scenario. The oval in this figure contains seven constant-range cross-sections from the return signal a radar might receive when viewing the airport scene. Note the left and right transitions in the signals corresponding to the boundaries between the higher-amplitude terrain returns and those of lower-amplitude from the runway. If the seven constant-range cross-sections of Figure 27 were to be averaged (along each azimuth line), a composite waveform would be derived which could be analyzed as illustrated in Figure 28. Because of its general shape, the plot of this waveform is referred to as a "gutter" plot.

Three parameters can be defined using the gutter plot which it was felt might be useful in characterizing how well the runway can be distinguished from the surrounding terrain. Contrast is a function of the average signal level received from the runway relative to that received from the surrounding terrain.





Figure 26. Illustration of Radar Reflectivity



**Figure 27. Illustration of Basic Radar Signature for Runway-Terrain Scenario**




Figure 28. Illustration of Simple Gutter Plot with Basic Image Quality Metrics Indicated

Intuitively from Figure 28, the contrast improves as the terrain brightness becomes increasingly larger than the runway brightness.

The notion of sharpness is also illustrated in Figure 28. Sharpness is defined as the inverse of the angular extent in azimuth over which the low-to-high or high-to-low transition occurs. If these angular extents are very small, then the transition will be clear and distinct and can be identified easily by the pilot. And since sharpness is inversely proportional to the angular transition, larger sharpness values are desirable.

The final parameter illustrated in Figure 28 is variability, which is a measure of the standard deviation of the radar signal amplitude. For a waveform such as that shown in Figure 28, there are three variability measures - one for each side of the terrain and one for the runway. Large variability's correspond to "noisy" or "spiky" return signals which can mask actual surface transitions or be taken to falsely represent surface transitions not present in the scene.

This definition of variability is closely related to the term speckle noise, which is used to describe the random variations seen in signals returned from nominally homogeneous areas, such as a section of asphalt pavement, or a patch of uniform grass. While large amounts of speckle noise within an image will certainly be distracting to the pilot, smaller amounts should be tolerable, and may even have the desirable effect of giving the image texture and facilitating depth perception by the pilot. In general, however, low speckle noise levels (small variability's) are desirable in the radar data.

In order to quantify small and large variability's, the parameter actually measured under this program was the signal-to-variability ratio. This ratio was obtained by dividing the signal level difference between the terrain and the runway by the weighted average variability for the terrain and runway.

The image quality metrics defined above were computed for the data provided by the Honeywell radar at two points in the systems. First, the raw data output provided by the radar receiver was analyzed. These data were obtained prior to the processing necessary for presenting these data to the HUD. The raw radar data were not recorded continuously, but a discrete image corresponding to a complete azimuth scan of the radar was captured roughly every four seconds during approach and roll-out. Each of these discrete raw radar data images is called a snapshot. The image quality analyses of these snapshots were performed by GTRI and are described in this report ( Section 3.4.8).

Second, the same image quality metrics were computed for the RS-170 video presentation of the radar data, just prior to display on the HUD. These video images were presented in

standard C-scope format (elevation versus azimuth), and the update rate for these video images as provided by the radar was approximately 10 per second. The analyses of these RS-170 radar video data are documented later in this report in section 3.4.8 titled Image Quality Performance.

One of the objectives of the analyses performed of the Synthetic Vision Program data was to apply identical metrics to identical regions within the raw radar data (snapshots) and the RS-170 radar image data available for display on the HUD. The metrics computed from the raw data would represent the potential for runway detection and recognition offered by the radar. Those computed from the processed RS-170 data would indicate how well the Honeywell image processing methodology took advantage of this potential, as well as what, if any, degradations were introduced by formatting the data for presentation on the HUD.

Thus, the use of identical image quality metrics for the two processes was essential. The three described above - contrast, sharpness, and signal-to-variability ratio - were suitable for both applications and were thus agreed upon at the outset of the analysis efforts.

The three image quality parameters described above are just some of the radar characteristics which are important in the SV application. Table 12 below lists these and others. For each characteristic, the associated units are indicated, as well as the significance of the characteristic and the source of the measurement. Some analyses could best be performed at the tower; whereas others were performed both at the tower and during the flight tests. In addition, two of the characteristics were assessed only in the flight tests and were evaluated based on subjective pilot opinion, rather than on pilot-independent analysis of the raw data. These characteristics are so noted in Table 12.

**Table 12. Selected Radar Characteristics Important for Synthetic Vision**

Characteristics	Units	Significance	Assessment Source
Contrast	-	Runway Detection & ID	Tower, Flight
Sharpness	degrees-1	Runway Detection & ID	Tower, Flight
Variability	-	Runway Detection & ID	Tower, Flight
Pt Scatterer Range Response	-	Range Resolution	Tower
Pt Scatterer Angle Response	-	Azimuth Resolution	Tower
Geometric Distortion	-	Runway Detection and ID	Subj. Pilot Assessment
Field of View	deg x deg	Sensor Coverage	Tower
Sensor Update Rate	frames/se c	Image Continuity	Subj. Pilot Assessment
Radar Cross Section*	dBsm	Detection vs. Range	Tower, Flight
Reflectivity ( $\sigma^{\circ}$ )*	dB	Detection vs. Range	Tower, Flight
Volumetric Reflectivity*	dBm	Detection vs. Range	Tower, Flight
Path Attenuation*	dB/km	Detection vs. Range	Tower, Flight

Note: \* indicates measurement requires fully calibrated data.

As indicated earlier in this report, surface reflectivity (and RCS), volumetric reflectivity, and atmospheric attenuation are all fundamental phenomenological parameters. The accurate measurement of these parameters requires that the radar be fully calibrated so that absolute received power levels are known. This calibration process typically requires that a standard radar reflector of known RCS be placed in the scene so that measured power levels can be associated with specific RCS values. Typically, two or more such standard reflectors are used to improve the accuracy of the calibration process.

These four "calibrated" parameters define the basic phenomenology that determines how well the radar can image the airport scene of interest. However, for any given approach, they are not essential for quantifying the observed sensor performance. The observed contrast, sharpness, etc. *define* that performance. Nonetheless, the phenomenological parameters help *explain* the observed performance.

Not only are these parameters important in explaining sensor performance in a given scenario, they also are critical to extrapolation of the observed performance in one scenario to some other, different scenario. The contrast observable between a concrete runway and surrounding grass can be predicted based on the measured contrast for asphalt runway surrounded by grass, and knowledge of the respective reflectivities of concrete and asphalt. Thus, even though they require the extra step of fully calibrating the radar scene, these parameters were measured under the SVSTD program because of their importance for sensor performance assessment.

#### **3.4.7.2. Summary of Radar Performance In Flight Tests**

Measured contrast in clear weather was high, permitting the pilot to declare detection of the airport at a mean range of 1.5 nm, with a standard deviation of 0.26 nm. These detection ranges corresponded to measured contrast values between roughly -0.6 and -0.8.

The values of contrast measured during fog events were generally as high or higher than those measured during clear weather. Fog particles are too small to provide excessive attenuation of millimeter waves at the ranges important for these tests. The wetting action of the fog may also tend to enhance the backscatter from the surrounding terrain and thus increase the measured contrast. The test pilots were able to successfully detect the runway even in very dense fogs characterized by zero visibility or zero ceiling. Good contrast was observed in the measured data for heavy fogs characterized by 1/8 nm optical visibility's and vertical penetrations less than 100 feet.

The specific effects of rain on the available contrast are not well-understood. An attempt was made to extrapolate from clear-weather contrast measurements with the aid of the particle size distributions measured in flight. The in-flight drop-size measurements, and the calculation of estimated attenuations and rain rates from them, permitted estimates to be made of the reduction in signal levels due to the presence of this precipitation. These calculations indicate poor contrast at a 10 mm/hr rain rate and almost no contrast at a 29 mm/hr rain rate for the specific drop-size distributions measured. Results from the tower test indicate poor contrast at a 12.9 mm/hr rain rate but fairly good contrasts at 1.2 mm/hr and 5.3 mm/hr rain rates. Clearly, contrast tends to decrease with increasing rain rate. Contrast is also expected to be a function of the specific drop-size distributions encountered. Additional data are needed to better understand these relationships.

Accumulated snow was observed to greatly diminish the available contrast. When snow is present on both the runway and the terrain, this lowered contrast is due to homogenization of the scene by the roughly uniform snow layer. Plowing the runway enhanced the measured contrast by lowering the backscatter from the runway but improvement was not sufficient to produce a usable image. Falling snow, as opposed to accumulated snow, should not degrade the scene contrast significantly unless the snow is quite heavy. These conclusions for snow are preliminary since they are based on a small number of available snow scenes, for which quantitative physical data characterizing the snow (free water content, etc.) are not available.

The analyses described above indicate that of the three image quality metrics, contrast is the most important in predicting when the runway can be recognized in the image. The sharpness metric was difficult to accurately quantify based on the measurement technique employed. Measured sharpness values were typically about 1 to 5 pixels but varied in an apparently random fashion within this range as a function of distance to region of interest. There were also no clear trends in measured sharpness as a function of weather conditions.

Signal-to-variability results were somewhat more consistent. For slant ranges of about 1500 meters or less, the measured SVR values for clear weather, fog, and snow were typically greater than five. For slant ranges greater than 1500 meters or so, the SVR typically fell in the range of 2 to 8. A SVR of 5 indicates that the signal the pilot is trying to detect (namely, the transition between the runway pavement and the surrounding terrain) is five times larger than the background variability from which this signal must be extracted.

The SVR values measured indicate that in general for clear weather, fog, and snow, the signal to be detected is significantly larger than the background variability in the scene. These relatively large SVR values lend insight into the runway detection process that faces a human. Namely, this process is best viewed as acquiring a signal (runway-terrain transition) which has grown large enough to cross some detection threshold, rather than as a process whereby the signal (transition) must be extracted over time from a highly variable background which tends to mask the desired signal.

In this view, detection of the runway is largely determined by the absolute signal itself, rather than the signal compared to the background variability. And the most direct measurement of this signal alone is contrast. Thus, the relatively large signal-to-variability ratios tend to reinforce the importance of contrast in runway detection.

There is also considerable evidence supporting the importance of contrast. Throughout the flight test program, contrast was found to correlate well with the subjective image quality perceived by the pilot as well as by the radar analyst. In general, the measured contrast fell between -0.6 and -0.8 when initial detection of the runway was reported by the pilot in clear weather. Thus, the contrast at pilot detection was fairly consistent.

### **3.4.8. Image Quality Performance**

During each approach, the pilot was instructed to give a verbal callout when he could confirm that the runway image had been identified. Using the time of those callouts, the image quality was examined to determine if metrics commonly used in other imaging applications correlated to the detection of airport features in the MMW raster images.

It was planned that this work would be done using a through-the-HUD video camera, permitting the analyst to use the same scene used by the pilot. When the through-the-HUD camera capability was not achieved with sufficient quality in time to support image analyses, a secondary approach using the recorded sensor video output was used. This video output does not reflect the settings of the HUD raster brightness and contrast controls, nor does it suffer degradation from the outside scene brightness. However, since the pilots used a repetitive technique in adjusting the HUD controls, it was felt that the metrics would reflect a relatively constant difference between the measured values and those actually seen by the pilots.

The digitized image used for the analysis was made up of 480 horizontal image scan lines, each of which could have 640 pixels or dots of varying brightness along its length. Actual images from the sensors often did not incorporate all of these lines or pixels, averaging 463 image scan lines and 631 pixels per scan line. The convention for locating a point number (479) at the bottom of the image was to count pixels as 0 on the left and increasing to a maximum of 639 at the right edge. The digitized scene covers a full 30 Hz field of the interlaced video. The field is made up of two separate 60 Hz frames which are offset by one image scan line. Since the imaging sensors produce their video data at the frame rate (1/60 second), the interlacing causes the two adjoining even/odd scan lines to have the same or very close data values. This accounts for the characteristic pairing of data points seen in the plotted contrast data for adjacent even/odd image scan lines.

#### **Contrast**

Based on the GTRI work with raw radar data, the contrast between the runway and the surrounding terrain appeared to have the most promise as a correlation factor. This analysis of image quality is consistent with the GTRI analyses of raw radar data in the formulation of contrast. Zero implies no contrast; larger negative numbers imply increasing contrast with the runway darker than the surrounding terrain; and larger positive numbers imply increasing contrast with the runway brighter than the surrounding terrain.

The data plots used for the analysis provide the "runway to terrain" contrast for each video scan line of the image which passed through the runway. The image counts scan lines from the

top to the bottom, so scan lines with smaller numbers represent the far end of the runway and scan lines with larger numbers represent the near or approach end of the runway.

Figures 28 through 31 show the typical evolution of the runway scene during the approach.

- Figure 28 presents the runway-to-terrain contrast at 2.5 Km from touchdown. Notice that contrast increases fairly linearly from the far end of the runway to about mid-field (scan lines 121 - 135) and then becomes a relatively constant value (about -0.75) for the near end of the runway (scan lines 136-152).
- Figure 29 presents the runway-to-terrain contrast for the runway at the point at which the pilot identified the runway image.
- Figure 30 presents the runway-to-terrain contrast for the same runway when the aircraft is approximately 200' above the airport's surface and nominally 1.2 km from the touchdown zone. The constant contrast continues to be seen, the deviations are due primarily to interference of other objects such as intersecting taxiways or reflective objects along the runway.
- Figure 31 again presents the runway-to-terrain contrast for the same runway, but now at a point 50' above the threshold area. The decreasing contrast as the near end of the runway is partially due to the build up of "blockiness" in the radar's near field view. The effects of intersections and/or reflecting items are even more pronounced.

The correlation of contrast with the range from the runway at which the pilot declared a runway image was accomplished for 25 approaches covering much of the weather experienced by the SVSTD/SIED flight test and representative airports and terrain features.

The results are summarized in Table 13. Note that there are two columns for contrast: one labeled *Average* and the other *Best*, representing two ways of looking at the runway data.

- Average Contrast is the average over all of the scan lines going through the runway (i.e., all of those shown on the plot).
- Best Contrast assumes that the pilot only needs a few vertically aligned pixels to recognize the edges of the runway, and thus considers only the best contiguous scan lines (usually 4 or more) for averaging.

With the common band of recognition extending from -0.2 to -0.6 contrast, the data reflects more dispersion and slightly lower values than was seen in the contrast data taken at the radar sensor output. The most probable cause is in the processing of the radar data for presentation to the pilot on the video display. Some of the dispersion may be due to the use of runway contrast without a means to include other objects which aid in pattern recognition. Primary among these are the distinct and repeatable patterns created by runways, taxiways and parking areas as well as

by reflectors in the scene such as light bars, runway arresting wires, VASI installations, and structures near the runway. A secondary aid to recognition may have been repeatable patterns in the ground terrain returns just prior to reaching runway recognition point. These usually include roads, fences, and other cultural features.

#### **3.4.8.2. Variability And Sharpness**

Variability and sharpness were considered as possible metrics for image recognition. However, analysis of variability and of sharpness in the video data was not done when the GTRI studies showed that they had a very low correlation in the raw radar data which form the video data.




Figure 29. RS-170 Video Contrast - August 18, 1992-2B (NTD at 2.5 km)




Figure 30 . RS 170 Video Contrast - August 18, 1992-2B (NTD at Pilot Confirms Rwy)




Figure 31. RS 170 Video Contrast - August 18, 1992-2B (NTD at 200 ft AGL)




Figure 32. RS 170 Video Contrast - August 18, 1992-2B (NTD at 50 ft AGL)

**Table 13. Summary of Contrast Metric Correlation to Runway Detection**

PILOT CONFIRMS RUNWAY CONTRAST METRIC CORRELATION					
Figure Number	Airport	Flight ID	Contrast		Weather
			Average	Best	
4	NTD	08/18/92-2B	-0.56	-0.59	VMC
5	NTD	08/18/92-2C	-0.59	-0.75	VMC
6	NTD	08/18/92-2D	-0.50	-0.55	VMC
7	NTD	08/18/92-2E	-0.36	-0.44	VMC
8	NTD	08/18/92-2F	-0.51	-0.52	VMC
9	ACV	08/28/92-1A	-0.24	-0.27	W 0 X 1/8 Fog
10	ACV	08/28/92-1B	-0.40	-0.45	W 0 X 1/8 Fog
11	ACV	08/28/92-1C	-0.39	-0.50	W 0 X 1/8 Fog
12	ACV	08/28/92-1D	-0.24	-0.24	W 0 X 1/8 Fog
13	ACV	08/28/92-1E	-0.25	-0.48	W 0 X 1/8 Fog
14	ACV	08/28/92-1F	-0.42	-0.45	W 0 X 1/8 Fog
15	ACV	08/28/92-1G	-0.37	-0.37	W 1 X 3/8 Fog
16	ACV	08/28/92-1H	-0.40	-0.50	W 1 X 3/8 Fog
17	LFI	09/25/92-1B	-0.43	-0.50	6 SCT M9 BKN 12 OVC, 1 1/2 L-F
18	LFI	09/27/92-1D	-0.31	-0.35	VMC
19	NHK	09/25/92-1D	-0.23	-0.36	-X 3 SCT M7 BKN 10 OVC, 2 R-F
20	NHK	09/27/92-1C	-0.27	-0.38	VMC
21	MIV	09/25/92-1E	+0.24	-0.32	M5 BKN 10 OVC, 2 R-F
22	MIV	09/27/92-1B	-0.49	-0.50	VMC
23	ACY	09/25/92-1I	-0.18	-0.33	M5 BKN 12 OVC, 2 R-F
24	ACY	09/27/92-1A	-0.29	-0.37	VMC
25	ORH	09/26/92-2A	-0.32	-0.41	W 1 X, 1/4 L-F
26	ORH	09/26/92-2B	-0.37	-0.42	W 1 X, 1/4 L-F
27	ORH	09/26/92-2C	-0.37	-0.49	W 1 X, 1/4 L-F
28	HTS	09/28/92-1B	-0.51	-0.57	-X, 1/16 Fog
Average Values:			-0.34	-0.44	
Standard Deviation:			0.16	0.11	

### **3.4.9. Pilot/System Performance**

The performance of the experimental Synthetic Vision System and of the pilots in using it is reported in the form of aircraft trajectory and attitude states, and the subjective opinions of the pilots who used it. These data reflect the ability of the pilots to interpret and use several sources of information including, 1) the image provided by the SVS sensor, 2) the flight guidance cue, and 3) the HUD symbology.

The image provided on the HUD was used by the pilots as the primary source of information upon which to base the decision to go below Cat I minimums on Type I ILS guidance. The "runway-image" call made by the evaluation pilot was highly significant because it indicated that he had an image of the landing runway that was sufficiently good to continue below Cat I minimums, on a Type 1 beam, with no transmissometers (RVR data), and no touchdown zone or centerline lights. The altitude and range at which the pilot called "runway image" is an important measure of sensor and system performance. The safety pilot was required to execute a missed-approach if he did not hear the "runway image" call before reaching the published decision-height for approaches in actual Cat II or Cat IIIa conditions. Pilot commentary indicated that pattern recognition of the runway(s) and taxiway(s) played an important role in the pilot decision to call "runway image".

The reported results are confined to the flight tests in which the Honeywell 35 GHz MMW radar sensor was used as the source of the HUD raster image. Suitability tests with the 94 GHz sensor indicated a substantial range limitation. The reasons for this limitation are not understood but are believed to be associated with the radome, the limited power of the transmitter and limitations in the processing of the radar data. Because the runway image call altitude was consistently below 200 feet (Cat I decision-height), a decision was made not to conduct formal testing with the Lear 94 GHz MMW radar. Data obtained during suitability testing indicated that the average runway image call altitude was 168 feet (standard deviation 26 feet) and the range was 0.50 nm (standard deviation .08 nm). Another shortcoming of the 94 GHz MMW was substantial noise in the foreground at altitudes below 100 feet above the runway. This noise interfered with the pilot's ability to see the stroke symbology including the flight director. There were indications that the resolution of the 94 GHz sensor would be quite good in the absence of the above problems.

The Kodak 3 - 5 micron forward looking infrared (FLIR) sensor provided excellent image quality in conditions without measurable moisture. The performance of the FLIR sensor deteriorated in conditions of measurable moisture to the point that it did not provide a useful image. This was determined early in the program when the FLIR sensor was used as the primary

sensor on alternating approaches in actual Cat II and Cat IIIa conditions. After consistent results in actual Cat II and Cat IIIa conditions indicated the FLIR sensor did not produce a usable image at the Cat I decision height (resulting in a missed approach), it was decided to abandon those approaches remaining in the test matrix using that sensor. However, in all actual weather, the FLIR image was monitored by the test engineer, and recorded on High-8 video tape. Any instances in which it appeared that the FLIR might provide a usable image were followed by an approach with the pilot using the FLIR image on the HUD. The results were invariably consistent; the FLIR sensor did not provide a useful image in measurable moisture.

### **3.4.9.1. Experimental System (35 GHz MMW Sensor) Performance in Terms of Range and Altitude Where Pilot Called Runway Image<sup>2</sup>**

#### **3.4.9.1.1. Variation Between and Within Pilots.**

The variability of the runway image call between pilots and the repeatability of the call for each pilot are significant because they are measures of the confidence the pilots had in identifying the airport pattern (taxiways, runways, etc.) and the landing runway. A large variability would indicate that the call is highly subjective, and would be indicative of a low level of confidence. The average range for the runway image call was 1.5 nm in clear air and 1.2 nm in fog. The average altitude above the runway for the call was 500 feet in clear air and 385 feet in fog. The standard deviation was approximately 1/4 nm in range and 100 feet in altitude, both in fog and in clear air. These trends were reasonably consistent across all three of the evaluation pilots. Pilot commentary indicated that the runway image call was made only after it was possible to identify the landing runway with a high level of certainty. They also noted that the image tended to "pop into the field-of-view" suddenly and with reasonable quality as opposed to a more gradual improvement from poor to good image quality. This may explain why the image call ranges and altitudes were quite repeatable with each pilot, and were consistent between pilots.

#### **3.4.9.1.2. Effect of Fog On Runway Image Call**

The effect of fog compared to clear air on the range and altitude for the runway image call was not operationally significant. In fact, the pilots were not aware that there was a measurable degradation until the data were plotted. It will be noted that this slight degradation on the range of the runway image call is not consistent with the slight improvement in contrast at the point of runway identification found in the analysis of the radar sensor flight test

---

<sup>2</sup> The range for the runway image call was defined as the range from the aircraft to the runway threshold. The call was assumed to occur the instant that the pilot initiated the call.

performance. While further analysis is needed of the data from the tower sensor studies, from the sensor performance studies performed as a part of the flight tests, and from the pilot performance studies to fully understand the differences found in them regarding effects of fog on SVS performance, the conclusion is clearly that the effect of fog on the radar sensor performance was negligible.

#### **3.4.9.1.3. Effect of Rain On Runway Image Call**

Increasing rain-rate significantly reduced the range at which the pilot called runway image. The data points at zero rain-rate were taken on dry runways.

The effect of rain on image quality is complex due to the variability of the rain activity as the aircraft approaches the runway (rain-rate tends to be a function of time and position). While the details are not well understood, the important finding is that moderate rain had a definite adverse effect on the image. The use of radar reflectors to improve the image quality in moderate and heavy rain should be studied as a means to overcome this deficiency.

It is notable that in all conditions where the rain-rate was high enough to degrade the radar image, the visibility reported by the tower and the runway visibility reported by the pilot were well above Cat I minimums. This experimental finding should be expanded by investigating statistics on visibility as a function of rain-rate and drop size distribution. If the visibility is only reduced to below Cat I minimums in very heavy rain, it could be argued that there is not a critical need for SVS in such conditions. Additionally, very heavy rain tends to occur in short intervals so that it may be possible to circumvent the problem by delaying the approach during the low-probability short-duration heavy-rain events.

#### **3.4.9.1.4 Effect of Snow On Runway Image Call**

Four approaches were made to Pueblo Colorado (PUB) with light-to-moderate snow falling. This was officially reported as light snow, but the tower noted that it was moderate on some approaches. There was approximately 1 to 2 inches of very wet snow (almost slush) on the runway and surrounding areas. The tower reported visibility was 3/4 miles in fog and visual acquisition of the runway occurred at about 300 feet above the surface for most approaches. Two evaluation pilots each flew two approaches. Both pilots reported that there was never a usable runway image on the HUD. One of the pilots noted that the approach light stands provided a good radar signature at a range of about 1.2 nm. The ability to see the approach lights before the runway provides some evidence that radar reflectors may be effective as a means to overcome the inability of the MMW radar to image the runway surface in these conditions.

Approaches were made to Pueblo and Colorado Springs (COS) the next day, after the snow had stopped falling. The conditions consisted of damp runways, completely free of snow, and with about 4 to 5 inches of wet snow on the surrounding terrain. There was about a foot of snow on the sides of the plowed runways. The 35 GHz MMW did not produce a usable image of the runway in these conditions at either COS or PUB. Again, the approach light stands did provide a good radar signature at ranges between 1.2 and 1.5 nm. The visibility on these approaches was 3 miles at PUB increasing to 10 miles at COS.

#### **3.4.10. Subjective Pilot Ratings**

Two subjective rating scales and a questionnaire were used to quantify pilot opinion and guide the pilot commentary. The two rating scales are presented in Figures 32 and 33. The Modified Cooper Harper (MCH) scale was used to obtain some insight into the pilot workload associated with use of the synthetic vision system. The Cooper-Harper scale was used in the SVS experiments because it also addresses pilot workload, and is considered reliable as a result of extensive use over the past 20 years. Experience has shown that the MCH workload ratings essentially always track the Cooper Harper handling qualities ratings (HQRs). That proved to be the case in the SVS experiments. For this reason, only the MCH workload ratings are presented and discussed in this overview.

Separate ratings were assigned for the approach, the landing flare, and the rollout. The approach rating pertained only to the portion of the approach from 200 feet above the runway to the 50 foot flare point. All subjective pilot ratings must be referenced to some defined level of aggressiveness, hence performance standards must be established. The performance standards used in this program are summarized in Table 14.




Figure 33. Cooper Harper Handling Qualities Rating (HQR) Scale





Figure 34. Modified Cooper Harper Workload Rating Scale (MCH)

**Table 14 Performance Standards**


	<b>Desired Performance</b>	<b>Adequate Performance</b>
Glideslope and localizer tracking above 200 ft. AGL.	± 1 dot	± 2 dot
Glideslope and localizer tracking between 200 and 50 ft AGL.	± 0.50 dots	± 1 dot
Airspeed control with respect to target speed.	± 5 knots	+ 10 knots - 5 knots
Flare performance	Touchdown between 1000 and 2000 feet of the runway threshold.  Touchdown within 10 feet of centerline  Sink rate subjectively smooth-to-firm	touchdown at greater than 500 feet and less than 3000 feet of the runway threshold.  Touchdown on runway with at least 5 feet of margin from edge.  Sink rate subjectively hard.
Takeoff roll	Maintain track within ± 10 feet of runway centerline.  Achieve target climb attitude and speed with little or no bobbling or lateral directional problems.	Maintain aircraft on runway with at least 5 feet of margin from edge.  Maintain positive control of pitch attitude and climb speed. No safety pilot takeover necessary.
Landing roll	Maintain track within ± 10 feet of runway centerline.	Maintain aircraft on runway with at least 5 feet of margin from edge

**3.4.10.1. Pilot Rating of Workload In Simulated Cat IIIa and Cat IIIc Conditions**

The frequency distributions of the subjective workload ratings for approaches and landing flares to simulated Cat IIIa and Cat IIIc conditions are shown in Figure 35. This data indicates that the majority of the ratings were 3 (ie., satisfactory without improvement). This should not be construed to imply that the experimental SVS was acceptable as a certified system, but rather that it was acceptable for specific approaches under the specified test conditions; in this case simulated IMC. IMC was simulated by placing a cardboard shield in front of the HUD, and removing the shield at the appropriate time, e.g., 50 feet for simulated Cat IIIa. The cases rated as 4 or worse provide valuable insight into potential problems with an operational SVS and were investigated to the extent that resources permitted.



a) Workload Ratings for Approach Segment From an Altitude of 250 ft to 50 ft




b) Workload Ratings for Flare


Figure 35. Frequency Distribution of Pilot Workload Rating Data for Simulated CAT IIIa and CAT IIIc Approaches

### 3.4.10.2. Pilot Rating of Workload in Actual Cat II and Cat IIIa Conditions.

A frequency distribution of the pilot subjective workload ratings for approaches and landing flares in conditions below Cat I minimums is shown in Figure 36. Twenty-nine of the approaches received ratings of 2 and 3, two approaches were assigned a 4, and three approaches were rated 10.



#### a) Workload Ratings for Approach Segment From an Altitude of 250 ft to 50 ft



#### b) Workload Ratings for Flare

**Figure 36. Frequency Distribution of Pilot Workload Rating Data for Actual Cat II and Cat IIIa Approaches**

### **3.4.10.3 Summary Comments Regarding Pilot Performance and Workload Ratings**

All approaches made in actual or simulated Cat II or Cat IIIa conditions were acceptable at airports with long runways (e.g., Pt Mugu (NTD) and Vandenberg (VBG)). For approaches to shorter runways (6000 feet or less), issues such as beam bends, image quality, crosswinds, tailwinds, and pilot training became significant (e.g., Arcata (ACV) and Santa Maria (SMX)). The workload associated with short runways tends to be less severe if the runway image is available well above the decision height. The ratings of 10 all occur for cases where the runway image call occurred below 300 feet, and less than 1 nm from the threshold. This would indicate that better MMW range is more important for short runways where the margin for error is less. An early runway image call gives the pilot more time to incorporate the image into his instrument scan and control strategy, so that beam anomalies and crosswinds are more easily handled. For example, the problems encountered at ACV resulted in workload ratings of 4, and the runway image call was made at about 500 feet. The only other rating worse than 3 (workload rating = 4) was assigned at Carlsbad/Palomar CA (CRQ), which is only 4700 feet long, and the runway image call was made at 490 feet. The approach speeds (135 to 150 knots depending on weight) and handling characteristics of the G-II are similar to transport aircraft so that these results are directly applicable to that class of aircraft.

The flare and landing data are summarized in Figures 34b and 35b. They indicate that there were no significant problems with that task for Cat II and Cat IIIa. The pilots all indicated that the flare cue on the HUD provided adequate guidance. The exception was for the simulated Cat IIIc (0/0) landings where the workload was judged to be very high by two of the three pilots. The flare cue used for this experimental system was not optimized to provide a landing footprint that would insure high probability safe landings on marginally short runways, and in varying wind and wind-shear conditions. It would be important to optimize the flare cue for a commercial system.

### **3.4.11. Summary of Pilot Commentary.**

A summary of the evaluation pilots' commentary related to strengths and shortcomings of the experimental SVS is presented below.

#### **General Comments Related to Synthetic Vision System performance**

- All of the evaluation pilots felt that the system was viable as a means to achieve Cat IIIa minimums on Type I ILS guidance, and to achieve lower minimum descent altitudes on non-precision approaches.

- All of the evaluation pilots were enthusiastic about the use of a head-up display to assist in the transition from use of the image to use of outside visual cues.

#### Comments Related to the 35 GHz MMW Radar and FLIR

- The FLIR image was excellent, or it was non-existent. Excellent images were observed in conditions of haze or at the bottoms of cloud bases. All pilots demonstrated Cat IIIc (0/0) landings using the FLIR image in simulated IMC conditions with workload ratings of 3 or better. When there was visible moisture (dense fog or rain) the FLIR did not produce a usable image.
- The MMW radar image was usable to identify the airport and the landing runway. The pilots commented that they relied heavily on airport runway/taxiway pattern recognition to insure that they did not mis-identify the runway as a road or other object.
- The pilots were able to learn radar signatures of the terrain approaching airports. For example certain roads, fields, and towns showed up very well on the radar. It was important to learn that some objects produce a radar return out of proportion to what that object produces in the normal visual field. For example the radar return of a chain-link fence along the side of the runway or arresting cables across the runway at Pt. Mugu were very bright. The radar return of approach light stands was very bright and was often seen well before the runway image (e.g. Worcester MA (ORH) in rain and fog, and Pueblo CO (COS) in snow conditions).
- The image was excessively sensitive to the aircraft pitch attitude. It was necessary to conduct all approaches with full flaps to maintain the proper nominal pitch attitude of zero. In turbulence the necessary changes in pitch attitude to maintain glideslope caused the image to fade in and out. It also caused the raster brightness to vary significantly so that it was not possible to set the proper value. Pitch attitudes of greater than 2 degrees had a noticeable degrading effect on the image.
- The raster brightness that was best for the approach, was too bright after breakout. In Cat II and Cat IIIa conditions, breakout consists of a dim view of the runway at best. The edges of the runway were obscured by the green raster because the radar image was not perfectly aligned with the runway and/or the radar image was more narrow than the runway. Some pilots compromised by using a less than desirable brightness on the approach, and others had the Test Director turn off the raster at breakout. One solution would be to install a "kill switch" on the column, but this could be a problem if the pilot encounters a fog bank on the runway.
- The latency in the image was too large, and was estimated to be approximately 200 ms. for gentle attitude changes and 400 ms. for large angular rates. It was particularly noticeable in roll.
- The radar image sometimes "jumped", especially at low altitudes. It is suspected that this is a result of the altitude data used as input to the B-to-C scope conversion. The

altitude signal consisted of pure barometric data above 1000 feet and blended to pure radar data at touchdown. Significant variations in the terrain at low altitude would result in a discontinuity in the B-to-C conversion process.

- There was a tendency to get very low on short final when using the flight path symbology and MMW image to construct a 3 degree glideslope. This is believed to be a result of mis-registration of the radar image with the outside world. There is also reason to believe that the flight path symbology does not provide sufficiently compelling glideslope error data to the pilot at altitude below 200 feet.

#### **Comments Related to the Head-Up Display Hardware and Symbology**

- The pilot's head must be in a certain position to properly view the HUD, called the eyebox. For some pilots, it was necessary to make compromises to get into this position. For example, pilot LO could not use the toe-brakes. All of the pilots had to sit too low for an optimum view over the glareshield. It is well known that a high seat position is best when making approaches to very low minimums.
- Some type of auto brightness control is required for the raster.
- The flight director symbol was off the display in large (about 25 knot) crosswinds. The flight director should never leave the display, even at the expense of conformality with the outside world.

### **3.5. LESSONS LEARNED.**

Early in the formulation of the SVS Technology Demonstration, a survey was performed of the status of the technologies needed to demonstrate the SVS concept and the key issues were identified that would have to be resolved in the course of successfully implementing the SVS concept as an operational capability. As the Technology Demonstration program progressed, these issues began to be thought of in terms of operational, systems and technology issues with a great deal of overlap between these three general categories of issues. Summarized briefly below are the more significant lessons learned in the flight test phase of the SVS Technology Demonstration.

- 1. The quality of the image produced by the experimental 35 GHz radar system was sufficient to support approaches and landings in Cat IIIa conditions on Type I ILS guidance. A majority of the approaches were flown using ILS approach procedures and guidance. Terrain imagery cues were verified on the display early in the approach (typically 1200-1500 ft AGL). At about 450-550 ft. AGL a runway image could be seen on the display of sufficient quality to use as a reference for flight path control. At 200 ft. AGL, the flight test minimums required the presence of a good raster image to continue the approach. At 50 ft AGL a vision-obstructing cardboard shield was manually removed, if previously put up, to permit the evaluation pilot to transition to outside references. The flare and landing rollout were flown visually for most of the approaches. Other than in conditions of moderate to heavy rain or snow covered terrain, runway and adjacent taxiway image quality were good with lateral, near, and far runway and taxiway edges relatively well defined.**
- 2. Performance of the 35 GHz system in fog was excellent, providing good images in the presence of all advection or radiation fog in which flight tests were conducted right down to zero ceiling and visibility conditions.**
- 3. Performance of the 35 GHz system in light rain (less than 6-8 mm per hour) was adequate. In moderate (8-10 mm per hour) to heavy (22-26mm per hour) rain, image degradation consisted of a pronounced reduction in maximum range. The existence of pooled water on and beside the runway coupled with heavy rain further reduced the usefulness of the image. In all rain conditions encountered, however, runway visibility always exceeded that required for existing ILS minimums.**
- 4. Performance of the 35 GHz system through falling snow was excellent. In the very few snow conditions available during the test period, however, snow cover of the terrain surrounding the runway dramatically reduced the range at which a useful image could be attained. Although the runway approach lights could be clearly seen in the images on all approaches, contrast between the runway surface and surrounding terrain was nonexistent until very low (below 200 ft.) on the approaches. These effects were apparently the same whether or not the runway surface was plowed and even in the presence of piled snow along the runway edges.**

5. MMW sensor range is key to the identification of the airport runway prior to reaching the decision height (DH) or minimum decent altitude (MDA)/visual descent point (VDP) in an IMC approach where visual identification is normally required to continue the approach. The synthetic vision system must provide a synthetic visual image of sufficient quality prior to that point in the approach to permit the decision to be made to continue with the approach using the sensor image. Unlike today's instrument approach in which the performance of the human eye and brain permit an almost instantaneous decision upon reaching the DH or MDA/VDP, the poorer resolution and hence fewer cues in the SVS image will require a greater period of time for the pilot to assimilate the needed information and make the decision. The experimental system 35 GHz radar range was adequate for Type I ILS guidance.
6. A requirement for image enhancement is highly dependent on the intended operational use of the SVS system. Surprisingly, system resolution was not the limiting factor for runway detection and identification or for accomplishing the approach to the initiation of the flare maneuver. On the other hand, the somewhat coarse resolution of the 35 GHz system (approximately 0.8 degrees in azimuth and 12-15 meters in range), and the rather jagged runway and taxiway edges in the video display during the latter phases of the flare, landing rollout and taxi contributed to the very limited usefulness of the experimental system to the pilots for those operations. Although simulated (cardboard shield up) zero visibility landings were made, pilot comfort in lateral aircraft control in the flare and for taxi or rollout was degraded significantly by the lack of adequate runway edge definition and by the limited vertical field of view of the image when the aircraft was on the ground.
7. Antenna pitch stabilization is necessary to keep the antenna elevation pattern pointed at the runway surface as aircraft pitch attitudes vary during the approach and for ground operations. The usefulness of a runway radar image depends on consistency in the difference between radar energy forward scatter on the runway and taxiway surfaces (dark image areas) and back scatter from the runway surroundings (bright image areas). In the Technology Demonstration the antenna elevation angle of the 35 GHz radar system could be varied on the ground through adjustments inside the radome, but could not be varied in flight. Significant variations in image quality were observed on occasion with relatively small ( 1 to 2 degree) changes in pitch attitude on approach.
8. The specified maximum transport delay for the experimental system image of 200 milliseconds was exceeded in some circumstances with the 35 GHz sensor system by an approximate factor of two, reaching an estimated 400 milliseconds in periods of high roll rates. An image system latency of about 200 milliseconds did appear to be the value beyond which pilot workload and pilot acceptance rapidly degraded when the image was used as an element of the primary guidance system with the pilot in the loop. The transport delay experienced was largely a function of the limitations of the processing used in the experimental system.

9. In addition to precision ILS approaches, localizer-only ILS approaches and a few non-visual (for the final segment of the approach) were flown with the 35 GHz system. During the limited tests performed, the vertical path was managed by the pilot primarily through the combined use of the raster image of the runway, the HUD flight path marker (velocity vector) and the flight path reference symbols. It became clear in these tests that precise registration must be achieved between the raster image, the HUD symbology and the outside scene. Errors in registration of less than 1/2 degree seriously affected the pilots' workload and vertical path management performance.
10. Further development and testing is required to establish the minimum requirements for SVS technology to support detection and avoidance of runway and taxiway intrusions and to support pilot situation awareness on the airport surface. The ability of the experimental 35 GHz MMW system to provide runway intrusion information was tested briefly by intentionally placing a runway intruder (pickup truck) at various locations on the runway and taxiways during approaches and a takeoff without the pilot's knowledge and with the pilot's external vision restricted by a cardboard shield in front of the HUD. The pilot quite successfully detected the intrusions in each instance during the approach and accomplished the missed approach in a timely manner. The pilot did not detect the intrusion on the takeoff roll due to the obscuration of the obstacle in the image by the HUD symbology. The pilots were unable to detect and identify obstacles in other tests while on the airport surface with the experimental SVS because of the limitations in resolution, minimum range and limited vertical field of view. Very limited experimentation with other presentation formats indicated that such formats as head-down non-conformal representations of the runway image offer promising solutions for runway roll-out and taxi guidance as well as obstacle detection and avoidance.
11. Millimeter wave approaches flown using the 94 GHz radar resulted in significantly different image characteristics than the 35 GHz system. While image resolution was visibly improved, image quality was degraded by random speckle frequently interfering with image content. Maximum ranges using the 94 GHz radar were considerably less than required for operations below CAT I minimums; adequate runway images were achieved at 150 ft AGL or below. The significant factors thought to affect the performance of the 94 GHz sensor were the limited transmitter power, limitations in processing of the radar data, transmissivity of the radome material selected, and problems with reflections within the radome. The limited performance of this system permitted only limited flight test and no exposure to weather conditions other than dry VMC.
12. Performance of the Kodak 3-5 micron infrared sensor system was excellent in moderate (less than 80 degrees Fahrenheit) temperatures and in the absence of any measurable moisture in the air. Image contrast was markedly better than visual contrast in haze conditions and where the moisture was visible but not measurable. In high (greater than 80 degree Fahrenheit) temperatures, image thermal blooming caused a general

washout of surface terrain features and reduced operational usefulness. In dry moderate temperature conditions the performance permitted simulated (cardboard shield in place to block outside scene) zero visibility landings and supported good lateral control during rollout and taxi operations. No image was obtained during any of the fog, rain or snow conditions tested. Infrared sensor approaches were flown in day and night conditions, in temperatures from below freezing to above 100 degrees Fahrenheit, and in other weather conditions as specified for the MMW sensor using procedures identical to those used in testing the MMW sensor.

13. The HUD itself, even without runway imagery, reduced workload in the approach and landing.
14. HUD conformality and image registration are critical issues. The pilot depends on accurately registered image and symbology to provide cues for flight path control. The methodology must be developed and used in future SVS operations to ensure that hardware and software installation features provide the pilot a conformal, accurately registered image.
15. Increased brightness of the stroke and raster information displayed on the Head-Up Display is definitely needed in future systems. Improved control of the relative brightness of the stroke and raster information is needed. Also, control of the brightness of the raster image relative to the brightness of the outside scene is definitely needed when the outside scene appears during the approach. In the Technology Demonstration, high levels of cockpit ambient light sometimes caused the evaluation pilot to be unable to effectively see and use the raster image on the HUD. In some cases the stroke symbology was also difficult to see and use. To resolve the problem for the purposes of the flight test program, a sunshade was used over the windshield behind the HUD combiner glass. When in clouds the cockpit ambient light was much reduced and the pilot could view the HUD without the sunshade most of the time. Auto-brightness for stroke only was implemented in the HUD for the SVS flight test program and was only partially successful.
16. The flare control laws and display were adequate to ensure a smooth and safe touchdown virtually every time, and with minimal required training. Flare cues were adequate using the display and symbology cues alone (horizon, airspeed, radio altimeter height, flight director), in low visibility conditions. The flare cue consisted of a cross that filled the center of the circular flight director symbol, and flashed at about 1.5 Hz. Flashing of the flare cue began at about 50 ft. AGL during ILS approaches, and continued to touchdown. The flare cue did not, of course, compensate for lateral or vertical beam bends in the ILS guidance.
17. Coding the HUD symbology to annunciate when the display is no longer conformal is acceptable but the flight director should never be removed from the display. The HUD field of view (FOV) was 30 degrees laterally. During SVSTD approaches to landings

with high crosswinds (up to 35 knots at 90 degrees) the velocity vector became a dotted circle at the edge of the display, and the flight director vanished from the display.

18. HUD control laws were tailored for the flight tests using a fixed base engineering simulator at Douglas Aircraft Company. The ability to set the gains in the simulator and then fly them in the aircraft the same day was invaluable and undoubtedly saved much time in preparation for flight test.
19. There are as many different operational applications of SVS technology as there are users. Each operational scenario will have its unique functional requirements of the technology and will lead to variations in the systems derived to satisfy those requirements. At one end of the spectrum of applications of the SVS capability, and the most easily certificated and implemented, will be its use as an independent monitor of other components of approach and landing guidance systems. At the other end of the spectrum will be applications in which the pilot's cognitive skills will be incorporated as an integral part of the implementation of the SVS concept as a low visibility landing system. While likely to provide greater operational flexibility, this application will require greater certification effort because criteria for its certification do not presently exist. With sufficient development, SVS technology will substantially contribute to increased aircrew situation awareness and to the detection and avoidance of runway intrusions in all im-plementations.

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

*Potential applications of Synthetic Vision System Technology are extensive and there appear to be no insurmountable obstacles to its implementation from an operational perspective. These applications promise dramatic improvements to the economics and safety of flight operations in low visibility conditions.*

While this Technology Demonstration Program did not identify nor respond to any specific operational requirement, a carefully selected set of scenarios and associated flight test experiments were established in conjunction with the Program's Certification Issues Study Team to ensure that a reasonably complete cross section of potential users' interests were addressed. These operational scenarios included precision guidance approach and landing operations down to and through Category IIIc operations on Type I and Type II landing guidance systems, nonprecision approach and landing operations, no-navaid approach and landing operations, and airport surface operations including low visibility takeoff. While this joint government/industry SVS Program demonstrated the performance of *existing* technologies only and did not investigate any aspect of the costs of developing and implementing the SVS technologies, the Program's participants identified and investigated all technical and certification issues in sufficient depth to conclude that there are no insurmountable operational or technical or certification obstacles to implementation of the SVS capability.

*It remains for potential users to establish carefully validated operational requirements for low visibility operations from which cost effective functional and system requirements can be established.*

The SVS Technology Demonstration Program has caused the user industry, the manufacturing industry and the regulators to become aware of the potential of SVS technologies for substantial operational, economic and safety improvements. Substantial research is now required to establish adequate models of low visibility conditions and sensor phenomenology with which to examine alternative sensor technologies, to examine alternative system concepts with which to satisfy the user's operational requirements in the most cost effective manner, and to establish the relationship of SVS technology to other technologies such as GPS in meeting those operational requirements. Probably the most difficult challenge to industry is in performing the necessary economic studies with sufficient depth to fully understand the true costs and benefits of the many technology options.