

Vol 36 No 3 MAY/JUNE 2011

ACOUSTICS

BULLETIN



in this issue... **Annual Report 2010**

plus... **Chameleon subwoofers arrays in live sound**
Sound insulation through open windows
Noise breakout from a public entertainment venue

Chameleon subwoofer arrays in live sound

Adam Hill and Malcolm Hawkesford.

Introduction

A high quality sound system should provide consistent coverage over the entire audience area while at the same time keeping the sound pressure level on stage to a minimum in order to provide musicians, technicians and production staff with a reasonable working environment. These requirements have predominantly been met with recent advancements in line array technology, where horizontal coverage patterns of 90° or 120° are easily achievable, minimising sound wraparound to the stage. Coverage patterns in the subwoofer operating range (generally below 100Hz), however, are more difficult to control using simple 'one size fits all' system configurations.

Historically, industry-standard subwoofers have operated as roughly omnidirectional sources, radiating energy equally in all directions. In recent years, a handful of companies have introduced cardioid or supercardioid pattern subwoofers which can help to limit low frequency energy on stage, depending on the system configuration. In addition to this, system technicians have long used the technique of rotating every other or every third subwoofer in vertical stacks 180° to achieve an approximate cardioid radiation pattern.

Conventional subwoofer systems suffer from a number of constraints which can differ from venue to venue, including placement issues, rigging capabilities, sightlines, truck space and, of course, budget. These drawbacks, which will be discussed in the following section, can severely diminish a system's capability to meet the low-frequency coverage and rejection criteria[1]. With this in mind, it is proposed that an adaptation of an emerging technology for small-room

low-frequency control, termed a chameleon subwoofer array[2] (CSA), can circumvent these practical issues and easily achieve venue-specific coverage patterns that should benefit both the audience and stage areas.

Conventional subwoofer system issues are explored in this article, with relevant simulation results emphasising key points, followed by a discussion of common techniques for low-frequency coverage pattern control. Next, chameleon subwoofer array correction theory is presented in the context of small room applications and then the live sound adaptation is explained with emphasis on incorporating the system into existing industry-standard hardware. Simulations of large-scale concert venues utilising this low-frequency control approach are presented, highlighting the potential advantages of CSA technology in live sound.

Conventional subwoofer system issues

Units within a live sound subwoofer system can theoretically be placed and configured to achieve the desired coverage pattern. Unfortunately, there is a long list of constraints that usually prevent this, primarily stemming from production, venue and time restrictions, all of which will be discussed in the following.

Subwoofer placement

Disregarding production or venue constraints, simple subwoofer placement can be critical to define the overall coverage pattern.




Figure 1

16-unit cardioid left/right subwoofer system with system layout (a) and simulated coverage patterns at (b) 40Hz and (c) 90Hz




Figure 2

16-unit cardioid central subwoofer system with system layout (a) and simulated coverage patterns at (b) 40Hz and (c) 90Hz

Depending on the spacing between each unit within the system a 'power alley' (overly strong low-frequency energy down the centre of the audience area) can emerge along with any combination of pressure nulls which travel outward from the stage. The individual unit spacing can also affect the sound pressure level on the stage. This is due to the constructive/destructive interference between the sound waves emitted from each source where location of any peaks/nulls depends of the intersection points of the individual sound waves.

To highlight this issue, a virtual outdoor venue was created with dimensions 50 by 30 by 10 metres, where all surfaces except the ground plane and the stage were set as anechoic. Simulation of the stage has been shown to be critical for accurate results owing to interfering reflections off the stage, corrupting the individual subwoofer directionality[1].

Sixteen cardioid subwoofers (with the cardioid pattern achieved following Olson's work on gradient loudspeakers[3]) were initially placed in stacks of two in left/right clusters to simulate placement outside the stage corners, in line with the main PA. Sinusoidal test signals at 40 and 90 Hz were used to analyse the pressure distribution of the system (Figure 1).

The left/right clusters give clear nulls within the central audience area as a result of destructive interference between the clusters. Also, stage rejection appears to suffer from the wide spacing causing a high stage sound pressure level. Repositioning the units with equal spacing across the stage front can result in a significant reduction of the pressure

nulls within the audience and also improve stage rejection (Figure 2).

The equal spacing configuration evokes higher sound levels within the front rows of the audience (which can be a safety issue), while the left/right system does not produce this effect for the audience centre. Also, the equally spaced system causes a power alley to arise due to the constructive interference from all units coinciding at the centre axis of the system. Often, this power alley issue is ignored since the front-of-house (FOH) engineer is located at the venue centre, which coincides with the optimal location for the best stereo effect from the main PA. Moving off centre will gradually result in a diminished stereo effect and a reduction in low-frequency sound level. This is undesirable since the goal is to deliver equal low-frequency energy to a large audience area. It is also important that subwoofers are not positioned directly below the stage. This sort of placement has been demonstrated to diminish subwoofer directionality[1] and is apparent in Figure 2 with the higher sound pressure level on the stage due to reflections off the stage decking.

Practical issues

Subwoofer spacing and stage proximity often become moot points because of practical constraints. To begin with, the system must be

continued on page 35




Figure 3

Eight-unit left/right flown subwoofer arrays with system layout (a) and simulated coverage patterns at (b) 40Hz and (c) 90Hz




Figure 4

Eight-unit centrally flown subwoofer arrays with system layout in (a) and simulated coverage patterns at (b) 40Hz and (c) 90Hz




Figure 5

Left/right steerable clusters for 270° audience coverage with system layout (a) and simulated coverage patterns at (b) 40Hz and (c) 90Hz




Figure 6

Central flown steerable cluster for 360° audience coverage with system layout (a) and simulated coverage patterns at (b) 40Hz and (c) 90Hz

Chameleon subwoofer arrays in live sound - continued from page 33

transported to the venue. This requires a significant amount of truck space leading to greater fuel, driver and transportation permit costs. Owing to a restricted production budget, the sound system is often reduced in size to fit the allocated truck space, resulting in a less than desirable system before it even reaches the venue.

Once at the venue, subwoofer placement usually is compromised to meet the sightline, set piece, lighting, video and venue requirements. These factors will cause the system configuration to be altered from venue to venue, requiring manual system tuning which there is not always an abundance of time to carry out. Larger venues can often provide the necessary roof support for flown subwoofer arrays which can help avoid many of the above mentioned issues with the cost of additional time to rig the system. An additional factor largely overlooked pertaining to ground stacked systems is the low-frequency absorptive properties of a large audience, which can potentially cause conflict between theoretical predictions and practical measurements in terms of front to back audience coverage[4].

Common control techniques

The practical issues that impact the design of a subwoofer system have led to the development of a number of alternatives to the standard ground-based in-line subwoofer systems. The majority of these solutions involve spatially-compact configurations, clear of sightlines. These systems benefit from using fewer well-configured subwoofers as opposed to many arbitrarily placed units, saving truck space, fuel and money.

Flown subwoofer arrays

Many larger venues are capable of supporting flown arrays, both for

the main PA and subwoofer system. These systems benefit from being out of the way of audience sightlines as well as sufficiently far from the staging to avoid unwanted resonances. In addition to this, flown subwoofer arrays (and the main PA) benefit from less difference in propagation length between the closest and farthest listener. For ground-based systems the closest listeners are within a few metres of at least one of the system units while flown arrays are generally suspended many metres above the stage resulting in a more uniform front-to-back sound field where the audience in the first few rows receives approximately equal sound energy as those in the back rows. One disadvantage of flown subwoofer arrays is the loss of the Waterhouse effect[5], which gives ground-based systems 6dB of added sound pressure output owing to the close proximity to the ground plane.

Most common configurations of flown arrays use left/right subwoofer vertical arrays flown directly beside the main PA hangs. These configurations suffer from pressure nulls similar to ground-based clusters due to the spacing of the arrays. This problem is demonstrated in Figure 3 where eight-box left/right vertical flown arrays were simulated using the previously-used virtual venue with the lowest box in the array at a height of 6m.

The flown left/right arrays do not provide adequate stage rejection owing to their height above the stage. Following a similar line of reasoning to that used for ground-based systems, a central flown subwoofer cluster can be simulated to demonstrate more even left-to-right coverage owing to the decreased horizontal spacing of the units (Figure 4).

While this central cluster technique can provide more uniform low-frequency coverage it also restricts the placement of video screens,

continued on page 37




Figure 7

Small-room CSA implementation with (a) correction setup, (b) 36-point virtual walking test layout and (c) corrected frequency responses over the walking path




Figure 8

Unprocessed left/right eight-unit cardioid subwoofer system with system layout (a) and simulated coverage patterns at (b) 40Hz and (c) 90Hz




Figure 9

Unprocessed central eight-unit cardioid subwoofer system with system layout (a) and simulated coverage patterns at (b) 40Hz and (c) 90Hz




Figure 10

CSA stage-controlled left/right eight-unit cardioid subwoofer system. System layout shown in (a) (target points are shown as +), and simulated coverage patterns at (b) 40Hz and (c) 90Hz

Chameleon subwoofer arrays in live sound - continued from page 35

limits any low-frequency stereo effects and often requires large trim heights to be sufficiently clear of the performance area. Stage rejection is superior to the left/right system and the spatial nulls have largely disappeared, giving relatively even left-to-right and front-to-back coverage at both 40 and 90 Hz.

Steerable clusters

A technique gaining popularity involves compact clusters of omnidirectional or cardioid subwoofers capable of applying individual electronic delay to create the desired cluster directivity. This technique has largely been developed and explored by Rat Sound[6] and Meyer Sound[7].

The most common occurrence of this technology is with ground-based left/right clusters. These clusters can achieve acceptable stage rejection while also covering over 270° of audience area, a common requirement for events in large sports arenas (Figure 5).

The disadvantage to the left/right cluster configuration is that the two clusters still operate independently of one another and result in the familiar pressure nulls. While spatial limitations prevent these clusters being placed in front of the stage, some touring systems have employed a central flown cluster for applications with the audience in the round (360°). This sort of configuration benefits from the close spacing of all subwoofers, giving a very even coverage pattern over the audience area (Figure 6).

Subwoofer clusters, both ground-based and flown, offer system engineers many more degrees of freedom towards directivity control. This added control, though, requires pre-planning and also fine-tuning from venue to venue; time that is either not always available or often allocated to other tasks. Also, as seen in Figures 5 and 6, clusters can

provide the desired audience coverage but are not guaranteed to result in adequate stage rejection. Steerable clusters are an interesting technique for low-frequency control, but do not provide a robust solution for coverage control.

Chameleon subwoofer arrays

An emerging technique aimed at small-room wide-area low-frequency correction uses chameleon subwoofer arrays[2] (CSA). The chameleon descriptor is used because the system uses individual subwoofer units with multiple degrees of freedom which can blend into an acoustical environment by matching the natural room response over a listening area.

The foundation of CSA technology departs from conventional single drive unit, single degree of freedom omnidirectional subwoofers by incorporating four source components within each unit: one omnidirectional and three dipolar (one in each primary rectangular dimension). While a conventional small-room subwoofer system of four units gives only four degrees of freedom, a similar system employing a CSA gives sixteen degrees of freedom, allowing for detailed correction procedures.

A CSA requires calibration measurements to generate the correction filters for each source component within the system. This setup operates using a single source component at a time while measuring the resulting impulse response at multiple target points within a listening area. The number of target points is governed by the system degrees of freedom. With the measurements complete, a user defines the target response at each measurement location, which can be the same or different for all points. The data is fed through a matrix

continued on page 38

Chameleon subwoofer arrays in live sound - continued from page 37

equation to calculate the required filter coefficients to achieve the desired responses at each target point using the equation

$$H = X^{-1}Y$$

where H is an n by l matrix of the complex correction coefficients, X is an m by n matrix of the measured frequency responses and Y is an m by n matrix with the desired frequency response for each target point. The system contains m target points and n source components. If m does not equal n , the larger of the two will be reduced to match the other, discarding the extraneous data. This calculation is performed over all frequency bins in the specified correction range.

To ensure system stability, a number of checks have been built into the CSA system. Filter ringing is avoided by avoiding correction above the Schroeder frequency[8] (in the diffuse sound field range) by imposing

an upper correction limit regulated by the room's volume and absorptive properties. Below the lowest room mode the system is only pressurising the room, with little spatial variance across the area, so a lower correction limit is set just out of range of the lowest room mode. Lastly, dipolar sources are inefficient at very low frequencies[9] therefore the CSA is limited to omnidirectional operation for the lower correction range, as defined by the target point spacing[10]. Above this range all system source components will be active in the correction procedure.

To illustrate the potential room correction benefits with a CSA, a virtual room of dimensions 8 by 6 by 2.6 metres was created with a four-unit CSA at room corner locations. A large listening area covers the central area of the space at a height of 1.6m. Correction calibration was performed using the layout in Figure 7(a), where points marked A represent target points in the omnidirectional-only band




Figure 11

CSA stage-controlled central eight-unit cardioid subwoofer system with system layout shown in (a) (target points are shown as +), and simulated coverage patterns at (b) 40Hz and (c) 90Hz




Figure 12

CSA stage and audience controlled left/right eight-unit cardioid subwoofer system with system layout shown in (a) (target points are shown as +), and simulated coverage patterns at (b) 40Hz and (c) 90Hz




Figure 13

CSA stage and audience controlled central eight-unit cardioid subwoofer system with system layout shown in (a) (target points are shown as +), and simulated coverage patterns at (b) 40Hz and (c) 90Hz

while points marked B are the target points for the remaining correction range. A virtual walking path was designed, shown in Figure 7(b) and tested with an MLS signal to determine the frequency responses at both target and non-target points within the path, as shown in Figure 7(c).

The uncorrected system results in 3.92dB spatial variance across the walking path while the CSA-corrected system only exhibits 0.25dB spatial variance, a reduction of 93.8%. This highlights the power of a CSA for small room correction in terms of spatial variance reduction and/or real-time adjustment of specific target point frequency responses, owing to the direct calculation approach.

Live sound applications

As alluded to in the section above, a system that intelligently uses all subwoofers to create an overall coverage pattern would provide a much more robust solution to the low-frequency coverage problems faced in live sound. A CSA can easily be adapted to serve this purpose while fitting within current industry-standard hardware.

The CSA correction procedure is ideally suited for use with multi-component subwoofers, as described in the previous section: however, CSA correction can also operate on any subwoofer system given that each degree of freedom can be independently controlled. Cardioid subwoofers are becoming increasingly common in the industry, usually containing two independently controlled 18-inch drive units. The two distinct drive signals are principally generated within the system's control unit(s) which take the full-range input from the mixing desk and split the signal into relevant operating bands for each system component. CSA control can be applied by inserting an extra DSP unit in between the system processor and the power amplifiers. This supplementary unit will apply the control filters to the drive signals to create the target coverage pattern. Since the setup measurements are taken in line with the system processing, this procedure will not be adversely affected by any processing unit manipulations between the two unit drivers.

As with small-room CSA applications, the live sound CSA control procedure is limited by the number of degrees of freedom within the system and also the spacing of the target points. A subwoofer system driven by a four-mix amplifier rack on both the left and right sides of the stage will give a total of sixteen available degrees of freedom owing to independent processing/amplification for front and rear drive signals (two degrees of freedom per subwoofer). Frequencies with half-wavelengths shorter than the mean spacing between target points will not result in a uniform coverage pattern across the audience/stage area: rather, pockets of control will exist caused by the wide spacing of target points. Small room CSA correction procedures generally recommend a more conservative quarter-wavelength maximum spacing, but half-wavelength spacing is sufficient for the less detailed live sound CSA control procedure.

Unprocessed system results

A 50 by 30 metre outdoor virtual venue was set up containing an eight-unit cardioid subwoofer system with left/right placement. Simulations were conducted in two dimensions to provide simulation time efficiency. As with previous test, the system coverage pattern was simulated at 40 and 90 Hz for the unprocessed system (Figure 8). Following the convention of passive unit placement, an equally-spaced unprocessed central system was also simulated (Figure 9).

The unprocessed systems give reasonable audience coverage patterns, although the left/right configuration does result in the expected spatial nulls at certain points within the audience. Both systems deliver approximately 10 to 15 dB stage rejection compared with the sound

continued on page 40

Chameleon subwoofer arrays in live sound - continued from page 39

pressure level in the audience. At loud rock concerts this could amount to over 110dB in some areas of the stage, which can be an unsafe daily working environment for musicians and other production staff.

Chameleon subwoofer array results: stage control

A CSA can be utilised in an attempt to minimise the sound level on stage to ensure a safe working environment. Identical systems as in Figures 8 and 9 were used for the CSA methodologies with target points arranged in a grid pattern on the stage. All target responses were set to the measured average response, but with approximately 40dB attenuation. In addition, individual propagation delay was factored into each target response, based on measured delay time to each target point. Audience coverage is not considered in this approach, although overall system output is set to match the uncorrected system, so similar audience coverage patterns should endure. The eight-cardioid unit systems allow for sixteen degrees of freedom. As before, both configurations were tested at 40 and 90 Hz (Figures 10 and 11).

The stage-only CSA control results in significantly greater stage rejection (up to 50dB in some cases) but also highlights certain problems. Firstly, since the audience area is not considered in the control procedure, there are clear deviations from the unprocessed coverage patterns, most noticeably with large central nulls for the 40Hz trials. Secondly, the 90Hz trials show less stage rejection than at 40Hz. This is due to the target point spacing issue. The mean spacing is 3m which dictates that accurate, uniform control over the entire target area will only exist below approximately 60Hz. At 90Hz, therefore, there are pockets of control with the outlying areas not receiving clear benefit from the CSA procedure.

Chameleon subwoofer array results: stage and audience control

To evade the problems present with stage-only CSA control, the sixteen target points can be divided between the stage and audience area. The stage target responses will remain unchanged from the previous examples, while the audience points will target the measured average response across all points. This technique should provide more even audience coverage while maintaining the stage rejection (although to a lesser extent, because there are fewer stage target points). Again, control is limited to the target spacing, both in the audience and on stage, to around 60Hz. Identical system configurations to those in the previous examples were tested at 40Hz and 90Hz (Figures 12 and 13).

The stage + audience controlled CSA results show notable improvement over the stage-only control. The audience target points ensure that the coverage pattern is evenly distributed throughout the audience area while still minimising pressure on stage. The downstage edge of the stage experiences relatively high sound pressure level due to the target points' upstage placement. Again, the 90Hz results show pockets of control as opposed to uniform control which is due to the wide target spacing, limiting uniform control to below 60Hz. The central configuration, however, does result in even wide-audience coverage at 90Hz, largely because of the naturally even coverage of the configuration.

Conclusions and future work

A live sound application of chameleon subwoofer array (CSA) low-frequency control is presented as a new technique to limit the amount of low-frequency energy on stage while creating a uniform pressure distribution over a large audience area. While conventional control systems can provide up to around 20dB attenuation on stage, largely as a result of the cardioid radiation pattern of the subwoofer units, CSA-controlled subwoofer systems have been shown in simulations to

be capable of up to 50dB of rejection while maintaining uniform audience coverage.

The live sound CSA control technique operates within the existing framework of industry-standard systems, using the independent front-and-rear drive-unit processing/amplification capabilities to allow for two degrees of freedom for each cardioid subwoofer. This method can be inserted into a conventional system in between the system processor and the power amplifiers, minimising the need for expensive new hardware.

A drawback with the CSA system is the target point spacing restrictions. Wider spacing corresponds to a lower control frequency limit. Above this limit control will exist in pockets, but will not be uniform. Tighter target point spacing can raise the frequency limit, but will result in a narrower control area unless additional target points are added, which would require additional degrees of freedom within the subwoofer system.

Future work required in this area includes running simulations in closed environments to judge the effectiveness in smaller concert halls and other venues. As the system can easily fit into existing sound systems, real-world testing can theoretically be performed to confirm the effectiveness of the CSA live sound control procedure.

Overall, CSA control can potentially bestow a robust solution to the difficult problem of providing equal low-frequency audience coverage while keeping the sound pressure levels on stage to a minimum. It differs from existing methodologies in the fact that all units within the CSA operate synchronously to give the desired coverage pattern, while other systems use independently operating subwoofers which require time-consuming manual fine tuning from venue to venue.

A J Hill and **M O J Hawksford** are with the Audio Research Laboratory, University of Essex, Colchester. This article is closely based on their presentation at Reproduced Sound 2010, Brighton

References

1. Hill, AJ; Hawksford MOJ; Rosenthal AP; Gand G *Subwoofer positioning, orientation and calibration for large-scale sound reinforcement* 128th Audio Engineering Society Convention London, UK May 2010
2. Hill, AJ; Hawksford MOJ *Chameleon subwoofer arrays – Generalized theory of vectored sources in a closed acoustic space* 128th Audio Engineering Society Convention, London, UK May 2010
3. Olson, HF *Gradient loudspeakers* Journal of the Audio Engineering Society, Volume 21, Number 2, pp86-93, 1973
4. Shabalina, E; Kaiser M *Live measurements of ground-stacked subwoofers' performance* 128th Audio Engineering Society Convention, London, UK May 2010
5. Waterhouse, RV *Output of a sound source in a reverberation chamber and other reflecting environments* Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, Volume 30, Issue 1, pp4-13, January, 1958
6. Rat Sound Systems, Inc Oxnard, California, USA
www.ratsound.com
7. Meyer Sound Laboratories, Inc Berkeley, California, USA
www.meyersound.com
8. Schroeder, MR; Kuttruff KH *On frequency response curves in rooms: Comparison of experimental, theoretical, and Monte Carlo results for the average frequency spacing between maxima* Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, Volume 34, Issue 1, pp76-80, January 1962
9. Linkwitz, S *Investigation of sound quality differences between monopolar and dipolar woofers in small rooms* 105th Audio Engineering Society Convention, San Francisco, USA September 1998
10. Hill, AJ; Hawksford MOJ *Multi-band low-frequency room correction with chameleon subwoofer arrays* Proc European Acoustics Association – EUROREGIO 2010 Ljubljana, Slovenia September 2010