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QUESTIONS LEADING TO THIS STUDY

1) What systematic differences exist between altimetric $\Delta g$ data sets derived from identical altimeters?

2) What is the impact of those systematic $\Delta g$ differences on geoid undulation models?
Three Altimetric Gravity Anomaly Data Sets are investigated (All based on Geosat/ERS-1):

1) **Sandwell/Smith 6.2, 1996, ~3’ grid**
   (SS 6.2 grid currently unavailable publicly)

2) **Sandwell/Smith 7.2, 1997, ~2’ grid**
   (SS 7.2 grid at: ftp://baltica.ucsd.edu/pub/global_grav_2min)

3) **Kort & Matrikelstyrelsen, 1997, ~4’ grid**
   (KMS grid at: ftp://www.kms.min.dk/incoming/GRAVITY)

These are each separately combined with terrestrial and ship gravity measurements and gridded at 2’ to form our three Δg test grids.
Altimetry was used only if the points were 100+ km from shore, and the depth exceeded 500 m.

The final 2' grids were computed using 2-Dimensional splines in tension ($T = 0.75$).

Due to a lack of reliable data in the Bahamas, all three $\Delta g$ sets were given identical $\Delta g$ values in the Bahamas.

Below: A sample of how altimetric $\Delta g$’s were combined with terrestrial/ship measurements.
Δ91 SS 6.2 - SS 7.2 ± 5 mgals
$\Delta g: 55 \pm 5$ mgals
SYSTEMATIC DIFFERENCES

Above: $\Delta g$ differences using S/S 6.2 vs. S/S 7.2 appear as noise at the 2' grid level.

Below: $\Delta g$ differences for all three data combinations, smoothed using a 30' running average filter show more clearly the systematic differences between data sets (predominantly in the Gulf of Mexico and Gulf Stream regions).
\( \Delta g(S/S \ 6.2) \text{ minus } \Delta g(S/S \ 7.2) \)
SYSTEMATIC DIFFERENCES

Left: $\Delta g$ differences using S/S 6.2 vs. S/S 7.2 appear as noise at the 2' grid level.

Below: $\Delta g$ differences for all three data combinations, smoothed using a 30' running average filter show more clearly the systematic differences between data sets (predominantly in the Gulf of Mexico and Gulf Stream regions).
$\Delta g(\text{SS 6.2}) \text{ minus } \Delta g(\text{KMS}) \ [\text{filtered}]$
\[ \Delta g(\text{SS 7.2}) \text{ minus } \Delta g(\text{KMS}) \text{ [filtered]} \]
CONVERSION TO GEOID UNDULATIONS

$\Delta g$ values are converted to geoid undulations ($N$) using a Fourier based Stokes' integration. EGM96 is used in the remove-compute-restore procedure.

Below: Differences between the three geoid models (from the three $\Delta g$ sets) are shown. Note especially the significant tilts between the models, deep inside the continent, as a result of only changing the altimetric gravity anomalies. (Remember, all three $\Delta g$ sets come from Geosat/ERS-1).
$\Delta g(\text{SS 6.2})$ minus $\Delta g(\text{SS 7.2})$ [filtered]
N(SS 7.2) minus N(KMS)
N(SS 6.2) minus N(KMS)
N(SS 6.2) minus N(SS 7.2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>SS6.2</th>
<th>SS6.2</th>
<th>SS7.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TX to CA</td>
<td>0.16/105°</td>
<td>0.07/143°</td>
<td>0.11/259°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL to MN</td>
<td>0.07/179°</td>
<td>0.09/143°</td>
<td>0.05/095°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Coast</td>
<td>0.12/148°</td>
<td>0.40/138°</td>
<td>0.28/134°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Coast</td>
<td>0.13/076°</td>
<td>0.04/207°</td>
<td>0.16/244°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACCURACY CHECK WITH GPS/BENCHMARKS

Using 3742 benchmarks with NAVD 88 leveled heights and ITRF94 GPS heights, we have an independent check on the N values at those locations. This provides an excellent way to determine if a tilt is improving or degrading the geoid model.

Below: The location of 3742 GPS Benchmarks in the NGS database.
### GEOID MODEL TILT, RELATIVE TO GPS/BENCHMARKS (ppm/azimuth)

(RED = best model for that area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>SS6.2</th>
<th>SS7.2</th>
<th>KMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TX to CA</td>
<td>0.21/358°</td>
<td>0.35/343°</td>
<td>0.30/350°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL to MN</td>
<td>0.13/003°</td>
<td>0.23/009°</td>
<td>0.25/355°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Coast</td>
<td>0.95/134°</td>
<td>0.88/133°</td>
<td><strong>0.64/132°</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Coast</td>
<td>0.52/264°</td>
<td>0.60/263°</td>
<td><strong>0.49/266°</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSIONS

1) The Sandwell/Smith 6.2 data set appears best for the Gulf of Mexico.

2) The KMS data set appears best for the East and West coasts.

3) Some combination of these two sets might yield an even better geoid model.

4) One mgal systematic errors are a significant drawback to altimetrically derived Δg sets.
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