

PROCEDURAL OPTIMIZATION AND MEASUREMENT OF PASSIVE ACOUSTIC
SENSOR NETWORKS FOR OBSERVATION IN MARINE ENVIRONMENTS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII AT MĀNOA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF SCIENCE

IN

COMPUTER SCIENCE

MAY 2015

By

Gregory L P Burgess

Thesis Committee:

Philip M Johnson, Chairperson

Andy Bumatai

Frank DeLima

Joseph B. Bogus

Keywords: Acoustic Sensor, Acoustic Network, Network Design, Network Metrics

Copyright © 2015 by
Gregory L P Burgess

To myself,
Perry H. Disdainful,
the only person worthy of my company.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to “thank” my committee, without whose ridiculous demands, I would have graduated so, so, very much faster.

ABSTRACT

Static Observation Networks (SONs) are often used in the biological sciences to study animal migration and habitat. These networks are comprised of self-contained, stationary sensors that continuously listen for acoustic transmissions released by sonic tags carried by individual animals. The transmissions released by these tags carry serial identification numbers that can be used to verify that a particular individual was near a given sensor. Sensors in these networks are stationary; therefore, sensor placement is critical to maximizing data recovery. Currently, no open-source automated mechanism exists to facilitate the design of optimal sensor networks. SON design is often governed by loose "rules of thumb" and "by eye" readings of low resolution bathymetric maps. Moreover, there is no standardized method for evaluating the efficacy of a SON. In this paper, we present a system which takes advantage of high-resolution bathymetric data and advanced animal modeling to provide optimal network designs. Our system also allows for statistical analysis of existing network configurations in order to create efficacy-metrics that can be used to evaluate arbitrary network configurations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	iv
Abstract	v
List of Tables	viii
List of Figures	ix
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Observation Networks	1
1.2 State of the Art	1
1.2.1 The Cost of Data	1
1.2.2 "Rules of Thumb for Sensor Placement"	1
1.2.3 Existing Metrics	1
1.2.4 Scale of Experiments	1
1.3 Requirements	1
1.3.1 Scope of Tool	1
1.3.2 Supported Workflows	1
1.3.3 Bathymetric File Support	1
1.3.4 Bathymetric Shadowing	1
1.3.5 Modeling Animal Movement and Habitat	1
1.3.6 Evaluation of Sensor Emplacements	1
1.3.7 Selection of Optimal Emplacements	1
2 Related Work	3
2.1 Yuan et al - Fast Sensor Placement Algorithms for Fusion-based Target Detection	3

2.2	Poduri et al - Constrained Coverage for Mobile Sensor Networks Constrained Coverage (K-Neighbor Networks vs Maximum Coverage)	3
2.3	Pedersen and Weng - Estimating Individual Animal Movement from Observation Networks	3
2.4	Howard et al - Mobile Sensor Network Deployment using Potential Fields Potential Field Algorithm	3
2.5	Akbarzadeh et al - Probabilistic Sensing Model for Sensor Placement Optimization Based Signal Simulation and Attenuation (Omni Directional Sensors)	3
3	Design	4
3.1	Animal Modeling	4
3.1.1	Animal Movement Models	4
3.1.2	Simulated Animal Depth Preference	4
3.1.3	Restricted Vertical Habitat Range	5
3.2	Sensor Projection	5
3.3	Network Model Ingestion	5
3.3.1	Customizable Network Models	5
3.4	Goodness Algorithms	5
3.4.1	Selectable Goodness Algorithms (Bias)	5
4	Results	7
5	Conclusions	8
A	Some Ancillary Stuff	9
B	More Ancillary Stuff	10

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

1.1	An example of included Encapsulated PostScript (EPS).	1
-----	---	---

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Observation Networks

1.2 State of the Art

1.2.1 The Cost of Data

1.2.2 "Rules of Thumb for Sensor Placement"

1.2.3 Existing Metrics

1.2.4 Scale of Experiments

1.3 Requirements

1.3.1 Scope of Tool

1.3.2 Supported Workflows

1.3.3 Bathymetric File Support

1.3.4 Bathymetric Shadowing

1.3.5 Modeling Animal Movement and Habitat

Ornstein-Uhlenbeck This is a paragraph about OU.

Random Walk

1.3.6 Evaluation of Sensor Emplacements

1.3.7 Selection of Optimal Emplacements

Here is a picture in figure 1.1.

Figure 1.1: An example of included Encapsulated PostScript (EPS).

Using the package we get the much nicer `<http://www.hotwired.com/webmonkey/98/16/index2a.html>` which LaTeX can handle just fine. Even better, the parameter to `\url` can have spaces inserted anywhere so you can make the LaTeX source lines in your text editor wrap nicely.

A few notes. It is recommended that you enclose your URLs in “<>” to ensure that any punctuation around the URL won’t be confused as part of the URL. You can use URLs in your bibliography too (see the `uhtest.bib` file for an example). Finally, if you need to use a tilde in your URL then things are a little trickier. One way to do it is like this: `<http://www.dartmouth.edu/~johnh/ff-cache/1.html>`. The `\url` style uses math mode internally, so we break the URL into two pieces, and stick a tilde from math mode inbetween the two parts.

CHAPTER 2

RELATED WORK

2.1 Yuan et al - Fast Sensor Placement Algorithms for Fusion-based Target Detection

Using data fusion for enhanced range and accuracy Constrained Simulated Annealing and Optimal Placement

2.2 Poduri et al Constrained Coverage for Mobile Sensor Networks Constrained Coverage (K-Neighbor Networks vs Maximum Coverage)

Density of Deployment Influencing global network properties via local restrictions Force dispersion algorithm

2.3 Pedersen and Weng - Estimating Individual Animal Movement from Observation Networks

Movement models Observation models Network Sparsity Home Range Investigation Assumptions when simulating fish movement in state-space models Fish speed and sensor area Observable space and total study area ?Environmental factors affecting fish behavior?

2.4 Howard et al - Mobile Sensor Network Deployment using Potential Fields Potential Field Algorithm

Static Equilibrium: Optimal placement vs Run time Runtime and Results

2.5 Akbarzadeh et al - Probabilistic Sensing Model for Sensor Placement Optimization Based Signal Simulation and Attenuation (Omni Directional Sensors)

Line of Sight modeling Weighted Coverage L-BFGS, Simulated Annealing, and Covariance Matrix algorithms Here is where you discuss the related work. Use BibTex to reference related work.

CHAPTER 3

DESIGN

3.1 Animal Modeling

Animals exhibit many different movement models and habitat preferences (both of which can vary in three-dimensional space). This greatly affects their distribution and thus the network configuration that should be deployed to capture their movement. Our program models account for both the habitat and movement preferences of the target species by allowing for various optional parameters and functions.

3.1.1 Animal Movement Models

To simulate animal movement across a two dimensional x/y space (as one would expect to see on a map), we provide two basic probabilistic movement models: Random Walk, and Ornstein-Uhlenbeck(OU).

Random Walk Model The Random Walk model assumes that animals move randomly through the environment. As a result, over the entire study period, each valid grid cell (as defined by vertical habitat range) will see roughly the same amount of animal traffic. The result is that every valid cell in the grid will have the same chance of capturing an animal's sonic tag. We assume that animals will be willing to very briefly (in probabilistically negligible time frames) pass through invalid cells to get to valid cells. This means that disjoint sections of habitat are still capable of seeing animal movement.

Ornstein-Uhlenbeck Model The Ornstein-Uhlenbeck(OU) model assumes that over time, animals will prefer to gather near certain points of interest. This concept models an animal's desire to seek out and remain near a physically significant structure, a region of high food availability, breeding grounds, shelter, etc. Users must provide the x and y coordinates for this point (as grid indices), the strength of attraction in the separate x and y directions, and the correlation between the x and y attraction as parameters to the program. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ornstein>

3.1.2 Simulated Animal Depth Preference

Some animals exhibit the preference to reside within a specific section of the water column; for example, prey animals may prefer hiding in reef heads at the bottom of the water column, while predators will prefer to hover several meters off the bottom. This preference can be incorporated into the behavioral model by specifying mean (Preferred Depth) and standard deviation(SD of

Preferred Depth) values. These values are given as a measure of the distance (in meters) from the bottom. For example, specifying a depth of '0' for "Preferred Depth" indicates that the animal prefers to live on the sea floor, while a value of '5' indicates that the animal prefers to live 5m off the sea floor. Allowing a standard deviation value allows for the modeling of animals that tend to be sedentary within the water column (a small deviation), and those that migrate through the water column (a large deviation).

3.1.3 Restricted Vertical Habitat Range

Some animals will live only in a specific depth range. For example, a deep sea fish may live only in depths of 300-400 meters. To incorporate this into the behavioral model, users can specify a minimum and maximum vertical habitat range for their animal. If this option is used, the program will only simulate animals in cells whose depths are between the minimum and maximum depths.

3.2 Sensor Projection

Normally users have a set number of sensors to place in the water. However, the question of How much better could my results be if I had had just a few more sensors? often arises. The program allows for the projection of additional sensor placements, and graphs how much more data collection would have been possible.

3.3 Network Model Ingestion

3.3.1 Customizable Network Models

The program supports three distinct ways to define sensors in a network: user specification, program-placed sensors, and projected sensors. User placed sensors represent sensors that already exist, and are being integrated into a new network. Program placed sensors are sensors that are optimally placed by the program, and take into account any user placed sensors. Projected sensors are Add new sensors (with optimal placement) to an already existing network Analyze the data recovery rate for a sensor network Create an optimal sensor network

3.4 Goodness Algorithms

3.4.1 Selectable Goodness Algorithms (Bias)

The Goodness algorithm is the driving force behind the selection of sensor placements. While users are able to write their own Goodness algorithms, three basic algorithms are provided:

Animal Only (Option 1) This option prefers to place sensors in areas of high animal activity, completely oblivious to the surrounding topography.

Topography Only (Option 2) This option places sensors in areas that have the best visibility of the surrounding area. This is useful for experiments where animal habitat is unknown or to be determined.

Visible Fish (Option 3) This option chooses sensor locations that have the best view of areas of high animal activity. Both animal presence and visibility due to topography are considered.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Here is where you discuss the results from your evaluation.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

Here is where you discuss your conclusions and future directions.

APPENDIX A

SOME ANCILLARY STUFF

Ancillary material should be put in appendices, which appear before the bibliography.

APPENDIX B

MORE ANCILLARY STUFF

Subsequent chapters are labeled with letters of the alphabet.