

Comparisons of VHF Meteor Radar Observations in the  
Middle Atmosphere With Multiple Independent Remote  
Sensing Techniques.

Daniel L. McIntosh, BSc. (Hons)

Thesis  
submitted for the degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
at the  
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE  
School of Chemistry and Physics  
Discipline of Physics

August 2009

## Abstract

This thesis describes the development, modification and refinement of a high-powered hybrid Stratospheric Tropospheric (ST)/meteor radar at the University of Adelaide's Buckland Park (BP) field station. This thesis also describes the process of statistically comparing results obtained from multiple co-located independent measurement sources. Also included are statistical comparisons made between meteor radars at BP, Darwin, Northern Territory, and Davis Station, Antarctica, with other independent sources of measurement.

Previous meteor radar systems have generally been low powered ( $\sim 8$  kW peak) and as such could only afford low count rates at frequencies of the order of 50 MHz. While it has been shown that the echo detection rate is inversely proportional to frequency to the power of 1.5, the use of lower VHF frequencies within Australia is restricted by government regulations. As such, this has led to the development of a high powered meteor radar system at 55 MHz which has served to facilitate higher echo rates at this frequency. The aim of improving the echo rate is to improve the statistical accuracy of results generated by the meteor technique. Also presented are descriptions of the meteor radar systems used to provide the data for this study and the basic principles of the meteor technique. Basic descriptions of the other systems and the techniques used to provide data for comparison are also presented.

Two key components in the development of the high-powered meteor system are the high-powered all-sky crossed-dipole transmit antenna and the high-powered 1:2 splitter-combiner required to drive the antenna. The antenna was designed using standard equations for Yagi-Uda antenna design found in literature and modeled using the EZNEC modeling program. After successful modeling, the antenna was prototyped and refined into a low powered version to investigate the antenna's performance characteristics. Once the performance of the antenna was verified, the process of upgrading the antenna to handle the full output power from a VTX transmitter was performed. This upgrade also spawned the design and development of the high-powered 1:2 splitter-combiner which would be used to feed the high-powered version of the antenna.

The successful operation of the high-powered system over several periods of observation has allowed for a more in-depth investigation into the statistical reliability of the meteor technique. Along with the comparison of standard atmospheric parameters, i.e. temperatures and wind velocity, the high-powered system has allowed for the verification of the relationship between echo rate and radar parameters found by McKinley, which is frequently referred to in many papers dealing with meteor observations.

Along with the comparisons made with the results from the high-powered meteor radar system at BP, comparisons of atmospheric parameters derived from meteor observations and other techniques were made at Davis Station and Darwin. Of particular interest is the unique comparison of atmospheric winds made at Davis between two independent meteor radar systems and a Medium Frequency (MF) radar. Previous comparison studies have only enjoyed the benefit of having two independent sources of measurement to compare and as such have not allowed for a unique solution to be obtained for the uncertainties of the techniques using the method of Hocking et al. [2001]. Davis Station is unique in that it has two independent meteor radars in addition to a MF radar. This has enabled for the reduction in the number of degrees of freedom in the statistical comparison process, and as such has allowed for unique solutions to be determined for the uncertainties when comparing two independent techniques; i.e. meteor and MF wind comparisons.

Atmospheric temperatures in the Mesospheric and Lower Thermospheric (MLT) region were determined through the use of meteor diffusion coefficients and derived atmospheric pressure models at Davis Station, BP and Darwin. Comparisons are made between the meteor technique and other co-located independent measurements. These include; airglow, satellite and falling sphere measurements at Davis Station, airglow and two independent satellite measurements at BP and two independent satellite observations at Darwin.

This thesis as a whole demonstrates the successful operation of the high-powered ST/meteor hybrid radar at BP. It also demonstrates the successful comparisons of MLT winds and temperatures made between meteor radar and other independent sources of MLT measurements. The validation of using the high-powered meteor radar at BP coupled with the successful comparison of atmospheric parameters derived using the meteor technique and other forms of MLT observations serves to re-affirm the statistical accuracy

and benefit of the meteor technique in observations of the MLT region.

# Declaration

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution to Daniel L. McIntosh and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968. I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library catalogue, the Australasian Digital Theses Program (ADTP) and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

Signed: ..... Dated: .....

Daniel L. McIntosh B.Sc (Hons)

# Acknowledgements

Well finally, I have arrived. Not that long ago it seemed like a dream that I could complete such an enormous feat in my life, but finally I am here! At last, writing the very last section of this thesis. A section that in all likelihood those who have been with me along this journey will read to see if they have made the cut. They say that every journey begins with a single step and that the journey, not the destination, is the most important part. I think that through these tired eyes I would begrudgingly agree... As refreshing as it is to have finally arrived at this point, it is not as refreshing as the thought of how the journey has prepared me for what lies ahead! From the outset I believed that this would be one accomplishment that I and I alone could achieve. Was I wrong! Although ultimately it has been my blood, sweat and tears (I kid you not) that has gotten me to this point, if it were not for an unbelievable group of people who have supported me along the way, I would not have reached this far. There are so many people that deserve thanks that I could probably write another thesis, however I will attempt to avoid the cliché actors fall into with the never ending speech thanking everyone including the goldfish!

Firstly I would like to thank my supervisors Professor Iain M. Reid and Professor Robert A. Vincent. I would particularly like to thank Iain for all the advice and knowledge he has imparted upon me along this long journey and for his proof-reading of this thesis. More than this I would like to thank him for those everyday chats about everyday things and for putting up with my rants when things weren't going my way. I would also like to thank Dr. Andrew MacKinnon for all his help over the years, starting when I was a third year physics undergraduate right up until now and beyond. He was in effect a supervisor from the beginning, if not by title but by action. I would also like to extend my thanks to Dr. David Holdsworth who helped establish me on this path of meteor science at the beginning of this journey.

Who could look past the Atmospheric Physics group. A great bunch of people to work with and socialize with. Over the years the members of the group have included Simon Alexander, Andrew Dowdy, Octavianus Satya, Bronwyn Dolman, Joel Younger, Raymond Oerman, Stephen Grant, Sujata Kovolam and Peter Love. I would particularly like to extend a special thanks to Peter for being an enormous help in IDL and LaTeX as well as providing a friendly ear to chew on.

For continued help on keeping the radar running, trouble shooting and the inevitable repairs due to those damn mice and other unfortunate accidents, I would like to thank Richard Mayo, Dr. Jonathan Woithe, Andrew Jenkins, Chris Adami and all the team at ATRAD. With all the problems along the way, I was beginning to think that some of those meteors were laced with my own personal brand of Kryptonite. Alas, such is the nature of experimental science. An extra special thanks to Jonathan for also being a great source for all things computer related and helping me out when all things computer related made me want to tear my hair out. I would also like to thank Chris for all his help in getting the VTX transmitter up to being a lean mean RF making machine.

I need to say a special thanks to Bronwyn Brown at the Bureau of Meteorology. Thanks for putting up your hand and volunteering your proof-reading services when you didn't have to. Hopefully it wasn't too much of an excruciating experience.

One's own sanity through all this can only be balanced by those they have in their personal lives outside the office, the lab and the field site. To my family who have been there every step of the way and in particular my Mum and Dad. Thanks Mum for taking me back in upon your return home, all the home cooked meals and of course the washing and ironing. I know at the time it seemed like it would never end and I would never leave but it worked out in the end. Thanks Dad for all the help, advice and the friendly ear over the years. At times when the going got tough I knew he was but a phone call away! Neither of my parents had the same educational opportunities that I had, so I hope deep down that I have made them proud and that they feel that all their efforts over the years have not been in vain.

Of course who could look past their best friend? To my best buddy Mark. You have been there with me through thick and thin, to hell and back. All those late night study sessions. The 'all-nighters'. The nights out on the town. Nobody could ask for a better friend. Your continued drive and

support through those undergraduate years and since has been unwavering and just what the doctor ordered. All the thanks and praise I can give to you and more. I hope all the good times we have had are only a mere sample of what is yet to come!

This may seem ‘fan-boy’ to most, but I would like to thank Jerry Siegel and Joe Shuster who created one of the world’s most iconic characters that I love, SUPERMAN! The character has served as a pleasant distraction and a means of escapism from the world of physics. To the magnificent composer John Williams. A man who has composed some of the greatest cinematic scores ever in movie history; scores such as Star Wars, Jaws and of course Superman. Your music along with with many other musical maestros have inspired some of my greatest thoughts and ideas. Lastly I would like to dedicate this thesis to the late actor Christopher Reeve. A man who proved to us he truly was a Superman. His unwavering determination and refusal to give up inspired me during the toughest moments of my journey when it all seemed hopeless. I would like to leave the reader with a fitting quote from this truly inspirational man.

*“So many of our Dreams at first seem impossible, then they seem improbable, and then, when we Summon the Will, they soon become Inevitable.”*

*- Christopher Reeve  
(1952-2004)*



# Contents

Abstract . . . . .	ii
Declaration . . . . .	v
Acknowledgements . . . . .	vi
List of Figures . . . . .	xii
List of Tables . . . . .	xvii
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Structure of the Atmosphere . . . . .	3
1.1.1 The Ionosphere . . . . .	7
1.2 Observation Sites . . . . .	8
1.2.1 Buckland Park Field Site . . . . .	8
1.2.2 Davis Station . . . . .	9
1.2.3 Darwin . . . . .	9
1.3 Scope of Thesis . . . . .	11
<b>2 Observation Techniques</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1 Meteor Radar: Overview . . . . .	13
2.2 Meteoric Diffusion Process . . . . .	15
2.2.1 Meteor Diffusion Coefficient Estimates . . . . .	17
2.3 Meteor Angle of Arrival Determination . . . . .	19
2.4 Meteor Wind Estimates . . . . .	22
2.5 MF Radar . . . . .	25
2.6 Satellite Observations . . . . .	27
2.7 Falling Sphere Measurements . . . . .	28
2.8 Airglow Observations . . . . .	29
<b>3 Radar Hardware</b>	<b>31</b>
3.1 VHF Meteor Radar System . . . . .	31
3.1.1 Radar Operation . . . . .	32

3.1.2	Interferometer . . . . .	32
3.1.3	Acquisition System . . . . .	34
3.1.4	Darwin System Description . . . . .	39
3.1.5	Antennas . . . . .	42
3.1.6	Buckland Park Hybrid System Description . . . . .	42
3.1.7	Antennas . . . . .	48
3.1.8	High Power Splitter Combiner System . . . . .	49
3.1.9	Buckland Park MF Radar . . . . .	51
3.1.10	Davis Station Meteor Radar Systems . . . . .	53
3.1.11	Davis Station, Antarctica MF Radar . . . . .	56
<b>4</b>	<b>High Powered Transmit Antenna Design</b>	<b>59</b>
4.1	EZNEC Modeling Results . . . . .	60
4.2	Schematics for Assembly . . . . .	65
4.3	Matching System . . . . .	66
4.4	Summary . . . . .	71
<b>5</b>	<b>1:2 High Power Splitter Combiner</b>	<b>72</b>
5.1	The Design . . . . .	72
5.2	Summary . . . . .	78
<b>6</b>	<b>Meteor Echo Rate Observations</b>	<b>84</b>
6.1	Verification of McKinley's Formula . . . . .	84
6.1.1	Establishing Radar Output Power Curves . . . . .	85
6.2	Receiver Gain Calibration . . . . .	90
6.2.1	Meteor Echo Rate Observations as a Function of Power and Wavelength . . . . .	97
6.3	Summary . . . . .	103
<b>7</b>	<b>Mesospheric Wind Comparisons</b>	<b>105</b>
7.1	Wind Comparisons. . . . .	105
7.1.1	Regression Analysis . . . . .	106
7.1.2	Interpretation of $\sigma_x$ and $\sigma_y$ . . . . .	110
7.2	Davis Meteor-Meteor Wind Comparisons. . . . .	112
7.3	Davis MF and Meteor Comparisons . . . . .	130
7.3.1	Meteor vs. MF O-Mode . . . . .	131
7.3.2	Meteor vs. MF X-Mode . . . . .	145
7.4	BP Meteor and MF Winds Comparison. . . . .	150

7.5	Summary . . . . .	166
<b>8</b>	<b>Mesospheric Temperature Comparisons</b>	<b>168</b>
8.1	Temperatures Derived From Routine Meteor Observations . . . . .	168
8.2	Atmospheric Pressure Models . . . . .	170
8.3	Davis Temperature Comparisons . . . . .	172
8.3.1	Comparison of Temperatures at the Peak Height . . . . .	181
8.3.2	Strong and Weak Echo Temperatures . . . . .	185
8.4	Buckland Park Temperature Comparisons . . . . .	188
8.5	Darwin Temperature Comparisons . . . . .	193
8.6	Summary . . . . .	197
<b>9</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>200</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Design Equations for Folded Dipole</b>	<b>207</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Radar Power Calibration Experiment</b>	<b>209</b>
B.1	Aim . . . . .	209
B.2	Equipment . . . . .	210
B.3	Making Voltage Measurements on a Power Splitter . . . . .	210
B.4	Measuring Coupler Calibration Factor . . . . .	211
B.4.1	Determining Calibration Factor for the Monitor Port. . . . .	212
B.5	Determining Loss . . . . .	214
B.6	ATRAD Software Power Slider Calibration . . . . .	215
B.7	McKinley Count Rate Curve Verification . . . . .	215
<b>C</b>	<b>Supplementary Winds Analysis Results</b>	<b>218</b>
C.1	Davis Meteor and MF Winds Comparison . . . . .	218
<b>D</b>	<b>Temperature Analysis Results</b>	<b>226</b>

# List of Figures

1.1	Atmospheric temperature profiles. . . . .	6
1.2	Australian and Antarctic radar locations. . . . .	10
2.1	Meteor detection day histogram . . . . .	15
2.2	Interferometer base line antenna pair . . . . .	21
2.3	Interferometer base line AOA estimation . . . . .	21
2.4	Meteor trail detection . . . . .	24
2.5	Spaced antenna technique . . . . .	26
2.6	Satellite limb sounding. . . . .	28
2.7	Three-field photometer plan view . . . . .	30
3.1	Meteor radar interferometer configurations . . . . .	33
3.2	Analogue signal processing block diagram. . . . .	35
3.3	IF filter block diagram . . . . .	36
3.4	Detector and IF Filtering block diagram . . . . .	37
3.5	A-to-D processing . . . . .	38
3.6	Darwin meteor radar block diagram. . . . .	41
3.7	Gamma-match arrangement. . . . .	43
3.8	Delta-match arrangement. . . . .	43
3.9	Quadrature balun circuit diagram . . . . .	44
3.10	BP hybrid VTX Meteor/Stratospheric-Tropospheric (ST) radar system. . . . .	46
3.11	BP hybrid STX-II Meteor/ST radar system. . . . .	47
3.12	Quadrature splitter circuit diagram. . . . .	50
3.13	Standard Wilkinson power divider. . . . .	51
3.14	The Buckland Park MF array layout. . . . .	53
3.15	The Davis 33.2 MHz receive antenna. . . . .	55
3.16	The Davis MF layout. . . . .	57
3.17	Davis MF transmit antenna and polar diagram. . . . .	58

4.1	The EZNEC folded crossed-dipole model with 2D zenith far-field pattern . . . . .	60
4.2	SWR response of the antenna . . . . .	62
4.3	The antennas far-field radiation pattern in 3D . . . . .	63
4.4	The 2D far-field radiation pattern . . . . .	64
4.5	Dimensions for construction of crossed-dipole antenna. . . . .	65
4.6	Cross-hatch dipole stabiliser and placement points. . . . .	66
4.7	Dimensions for the stability hatch. . . . .	67
4.8	Antenna elements fastening . . . . .	68
4.9	Feed-point spacer dimensions . . . . .	68
4.10	Location of the feed-point spacer. . . . .	69
4.11	Balun components . . . . .	69
4.12	Close up of balun mounting. . . . .	70
4.13	The finished product. . . . .	70
5.1	The 1:2 High-power splitter-combiner circuit with Gysel modification. . . . .	73
5.2	Lumped element quarter wave transformer circuit. . . . .	74
5.3	The 1:2 Gen-1 splitter-combiner finished product. . . . .	76
5.4	The Gen-1 1:2 splitter-combiner board. . . . .	77
5.5	The remains of the first generation 1:2 splitter-combiner. . . . .	80
5.6	The Gen-2 1:2 splitter-combiner . . . . .	81
5.7	The 1:2 splitter-combiner insertion loss measurement . . . . .	82
5.8	Gen-2 dummy load. . . . .	83
5.9	The 1:2 splitter board with remote monitoring interface board. . . . .	83
6.1	VTX calibration results . . . . .	87
6.2	STX-II calibration results. . . . .	89
6.3	STX I calibration results . . . . .	90
6.4	Receiver calibration measurement setup . . . . .	91
6.5	Underdense meteor echo . . . . .	92
6.6	Determination of meteor trail line charge density from received echo power. . . . .	96
6.7	BP count curve results . . . . .	98
6.8	Echo rate calibration factor. Both of these plots show the calibration factor determined at a frequency of 55 MHz. . . . .	101
6.9	Buckland Park theoretical and experimental count curves. . . . .	102

7.1	Example of scatter plot comparison . . . . .	114
7.2	Davis scatter plots with regression analysis results. . . . .	115
7.3	Graphical solutions for $\sigma_x, \sigma_y$ . . . . .	116
7.4	2005 Davis statistical result summary . . . . .	118
7.5	2006 Davis statistical result summary . . . . .	119
7.6	2007 Davis statistical result summary . . . . .	120
7.7	Davis Rx antenna polar diagrama . . . . .	121
7.8	2006 Davis zenith and azimuth count rates . . . . .	122
7.9	Davis 33.2 MHz and 55MHz skymap examples . . . . .	123
7.10	Davis wind velocity difference histograms . . . . .	128
7.11	Summary of histogram fit results for the 33.2 MHz and 55 MHz meteor comparisons. . . . .	129
7.12	Davis MF O-mode and 33.2 MHz meteor scatter plot . . . . .	136
7.13	Davis MF O-mode and 55 MHz meteor scatter plot . . . . .	137
7.14	Davis MF O-mode and 33.2 MHz meteor scatter plot compar- ison results. . . . .	138
7.15	Davis MF O-mode and 55 MHz meteor scatter plot comparison results. . . . .	139
7.16	Davis meteor and MF O-mode histograms at 88 km . . . . .	140
7.17	Davis 33.2 MHz meteor and MF O-mode summary of his- togram velocity differences for 2006 and 2007. . . . .	141
7.18	Davis 55 MHz meteor and MF O-mode summary of histogram velocity differences for 2006 and 2007. . . . .	142
7.19	2006 Davis 33.2 and 55 MHz meteor radar detections. . . . .	143
7.20	2006 Davis MF O-mode SNR. . . . .	144
7.21	Davis 33.2 MHz and X-mode scatter plot comparison summary. . . . .	146
7.22	Davis 55 MHz and X-mode scatter plot comparison summary. . . . .	147
7.23	Davis MF O-mode and X-mode scatter plot comparison sum- mary. . . . .	148
7.24	2006 Davis MF X-mode SNR. . . . .	149
7.25	2006 BP 55 MHz meteor radar meteor detections . . . . .	154
7.26	2007 BP 55 MHz meteor radar meteor detections . . . . .	155
7.27	2006 and 2007 BP 55 MHz meteor zenith and azimuth counts . . . . .	156
7.28	Scatter plot summary for 2006 BP 55 MHz meteor and MF FCA comparison. . . . .	157
7.29	Scatter plot summary for 2007 BP 55 MHz meteor and MF FCA comparison. . . . .	158

7.30	Histogram analysis summary for BP 55 MHz meteor and MF FCA. . . . .	159
7.31	Scatter plot summary for 2007 BP 55 MHz meteor and MF IDI comparison. . . . .	161
7.32	Histogram analysis plot summary for 2007 BP 55 MHz meteor and MF IDI comparison. . . . .	162
7.33	2007 BP meteor and MF velocities time series plots at 88 km .	163
7.34	2007 BP meteor and MF meridional velocities time series plots at 92 km . . . . .	164
7.35	2007 BP meteor and MF superposed . . . . .	165
8.1	Weighting function applied to AURA and Lubken data. . . . .	172
8.2	2006 Davis 33.2 and 55 MHz Meteor peak height variation. . .	173
8.3	2006/07 Davis temperature . . . . .	175
8.4	2006 Davis meteor and AURA MLS perturbations . . . . .	176
8.5	2006 Davis meteor AURA MLS temperature scatter plot . . .	177
8.6	2006 Davis meteor AURA MLS temperature scatter plot . . .	178
8.7	2006 Davis meteor AURA MLS temperature scatter plot . . .	179
8.8	2006 Davis 33.2 MHz and 55 MHz meteor scatter statistics summary. . . . .	180
8.9	2006 Davis meteor, AURA and OH temperatures . . . . .	182
8.10	2006 Davis meteor peak height temperatures . . . . .	184
8.11	2006 Davis strong and weak meteor echo temperatures at the peak height . . . . .	186
8.12	2006 BP 55 MHz meteor peak height variation. . . . .	190
8.13	2006 BP 55 MHz Meteor peak height temperatures. . . . .	191
8.14	2006 BP 55 MHz Meteor peak height strong and weak echo temperatures. . . . .	192
8.15	2006 Darwin 33.2 MHz Meteor peak height variation. . . . .	194
8.16	2006 Darwin 33.2 MHz Meteor peak height temperatures. . . .	195
8.17	2006 Darwin 33.2 MHz Meteor peak height strong and weak echo temperatures. . . . .	196
A.1	Folded dipole general dimensions. . . . .	207
B.1	1:2 splitter combiner electrical layout diagram. . . . .	210
B.2	Setup diagram for measuring monitor port calibration when the splitter combiner is used with a VTX system. . . . .	213

B.3	Setup diagram for measuring monitor port calibration when the splitter is used with a STX-II system. . . . .	213
B.4	Setup diagram for measurements. . . . .	214
B.5	Setup diagram for VTX system measurements. . . . .	216
B.6	Setup diagram for STX II-40 system measurements. . . . .	216
C.1	Davis MF O-mode and 33.2 MHz meteor scatter plot comparison. . . . .	219
C.2	Davis MF O-mode and 55 MHz meteor scatter plot comparison.	220
C.3	2007 Davis MF O-mode SNR. . . . .	221
C.4	Davis 33.2 MHz and X mode scatter plot comparison summary.	222
C.5	Davis 55 MHz and X mode scatter plot comparison summary.	223
C.6	2007 Davis MF X mode SNR. . . . .	224
C.7	Davis MF O-mode and X mode scatter plot comparison summary. . . . .	225
D.1	2006 BP 55 MHz Meteor and AURA temperature comparison statistics. . . . .	227
D.2	2006 BP 55 MHz Meteor and SABER temperature comparison statistics. . . . .	228
D.3	2006 Darwin 33.2 MHz Meteor and AURA temperature comparison statistics. . . . .	229
D.4	2006 Darwin 33.2 MHz Meteor and SABER temperature comparison statistics. . . . .	230



# List of Tables

2.1	Meteor wind velocity error codes. . . . .	23
3.1	Darwin experiment parameters. . . . .	39
3.2	BP experiment parameters. . . . .	45
3.3	Quadrature splitter component values. . . . .	50
3.4	BP MF experiment parameters. . . . .	52
3.5	Davis MF radar experiment parameters. . . . .	56
4.1	Antenna feed-point parameters . . . . .	61
4.2	Antenna dimension parameters . . . . .	66
6.1	Received echo power parameter description . . . . .	94
6.2	Meteor underdense echo parameters . . . . .	94
6.3	BP meteor echo powers . . . . .	95
8.1	Meteor SNR ranges . . . . .	187