MEASUREMENTS AND ANALYSIS OF ACOUSTIC
BOTTOM INTERACTION IN THE NORTHWESTERN MEXICAN BASIN

Michael W. Hooper
Gregory D. Ingram
Stephen K. Mitchell

APPLIED RESEARCH LABORATORIES
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
POST OFFICE BOX 8029, AUSTIN, TEXAS 78712

5 October 1981
Technical Report
APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE;
DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.

Prepared for:
NAVAL OCEAN RESEARCH
AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY
NSTL STATION, MS 39529
MEASUREMENTS AND ANALYSIS OF ACOUSTIC BOTTOM INTERACTION IN THE NORTHWESTERN MEXICAN BASIN

An engineering test of the Acoustic Data Capsule (ACODAC) was conducted in the Western Gulf of Mexico on 27 April 1979. In addition, bottom loss data were collected. These data were reduced using ARL:UT's multipath processing system. Calculated bottom loss increased with frequency and bottom grazing angle, ranging from approximately 1 dB to 6 dB.
Using available geoacoustic data and a bottom loss model, theoretical bottom losses were generated. A good match between actual and theoretical values was obtained. Thus, a relatively accurate geoacoustic model of the Western Gulf of Mexico was derived.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The Gulf of Mexico Wet Test exercise was conducted on 27 April 1979 in the area of the Mexican Basin shown in Fig. 1-1. The primary objective of the exercise was an engineering test of the Acoustic Data Capsule (ACODAC) system's ability to monitor ambient noise. In addition, signals from a series of SUS were recorded. The purpose of that series was to obtain information about the geoacoustic properties of the bottom in the region. The SUS source track, shown in Fig. 1-1, was a north-to-south line approximately 45 km long.

This region of the Gulf where the test was conducted has a relatively level, smooth bottom with a very thick sediment (1000 m thick). Geoacoustic properties of the bottom in the region as derived from available literature are presented in Chapter 2. The sound speed profile is illustrated in Figs. 1-2. Due to the bottom limited characteristic of the region, acoustic propagation from sources at a depth of 91 m is mainly via paths that reflect from and refract through the bottom. Thus, a thorough analysis of acoustic propagation in the area requires the quantification of the bottom sediment acoustic parameters.

The ACODAC system consisted of 12 hydrophones ranging in depth from 3200 to 530 m. The ocean depth in the exercise region is approximately 3400 m. The SUS were detonated at depths of 91 and 244 m. Due to the system electronic setup, only the hydrophone at 2290 m recorded data of sufficient quality to derive propagation loss. There were, however, sufficient data to adequately describe acoustic propagation in the test region.

The analysis was begun using the ARL:UT multipath processing system detailed in Ref. 1. The bottom loss versus bottom angle data described in Chapter 3 are the main data products of this system. Chapter 4 explains the bottom loss
FIGURE 1-2
SOUND SPEED PROFILE FOR WET TEST EXERCISE AREA
results in terms of ocean bottom (geoacoustic) models. These geoacoustic models predict signal paths and attenuation using sediment sound speed and density gradients, and the ratio of the compressional wave velocities in the sediment and water at the water-sediment interface. The first two parameters are obtained from geological survey data, presented in Chapter 2, and the ratio was derived from the measured bottom loss data, explained in Chapter 3. The final analytical step compares the measured bottom losses to those obtained from the modeling.

The measurements show the bottom loss to be quite low in the test region. For example, at 32.5° grazing angle, a mean per bounce loss of 2.0 dB occurred at 50 Hz and 4.1 dB at 250 Hz. Bottom losses calculated from the geoacoustic model match quite well with measured data. Thus, a geoacoustic model of the test region has been determined and can accurately predict bottom interactions.
CHAPTER 2
GEOACOUSTIC DATA FOR THE WESTERN GULF OF MEXICO

The data discussed in this report were recorded at a site in the Gulf of Mexico near the boundary of two depositional regions: the Lower Mississippi Fan and the Western Gulf. Figure 2-1 shows the Deep Sea Drilling Project (DSDP) sites in the area, and an approximate delineation of depositional regions. Of particular interest in this study are DSDP holes 90, 91, and 92, all near the test area.

Figures 2-2 - 2-4 give information on the DSDP holes. Lithologically, the most significant differences among the DSDP sites are the predominance of pelagic sediment in the first 500 m at hole 90, the presence of sand in the upper 500 m at hole 91, and the shallowness at which claystone occurs at hole 92. The predominance of carbonate ooze in the first few hundred meters at hole 90 is due to a failure of turbidity currents from the east to reach this area, while the upper 180 m of sediment at hole 91 is due primarily to turbidity currents from the Mississippi Fan. The deeper sediments at both holes 90 and 91 appear to be turbidites derived primarily from the north, northwest, and west. However, as shown in Fig. 2-2, sediments down to 500 m are coarser grained at hole 91 than at hole 90 and, in particular, sand is reported at hole 91 but not reported at hole 90.

Hole 92 was drilled on a scarp formed presumably by a salt diapir. The sediments at this site are much more consolidated than sediments at comparable depths on the bathymetrically lower rise area. The greater consolidation suggests that either the sediments at this hole have had a greater depth of burial in the past, or salt diffusion facilitated consolidation.

Figure 2-3 shows the density profiles measured by the DSDP at these sites. These density profiles reflect the lithological differences discussed previously. The
Figure 2.4: Velocity data calculated from density measurements of the DSDP using the velocity-density relationships of Hamilton for DSDP holes 90, 91, and 92.
densities of the turbidites at hole 91 due to the Mississippi Fan are greater and show greater variation with depth than the pelagic sediments at hole 90. Also, the density values of the three holes are largest at hole 92 where the sediments are more consolidated.

Figure 2-4 shows the velocity profiles derived from the density profiles of Fig. 2-3 using the velocity-density relationship of Hamilton. The velocity-density relationship for silt-clays and turbidites was calculated from Hamilton's equation:

\[ \rho = 1.135 V_p - 0.190 \]

Figure 2-4 shows the large difference between velocity measurements for holes 90, 91, and 92. The gradient at hole 90 is approximately 1 sec\(^{-1}\); at hole 92 it is about 2 sec\(^{-1}\), and at hole 91 it is between 1 sec\(^{-1}\) and 2 sec\(^{-1}\). Assuming that the experimental accuracy is the same at each site, one would expect, on the basis of velocity gradients and density contrasts, that bottom loss would be lower at hole 91 than hole 90. This would result from the shorter path lengths at hole 91 due to the higher sound speed gradient and the greater variance of instantaneous impedance with depth. Larger gradients imply smaller radii of curvature of the transmitted paths, and larger variations in impedance lead to more reflections. The relative bottom loss at hole 92 cannot be readily compared to that of holes 90 or 91 since the relief and shape of the scarp at hole 92 will significantly affect bottom loss at this site.

Figure 2-5 shows some velocity profiles found in the literature for the Gulf of Mexico, which provide useful comparisons with those derived from DSDP data. The solid curve is a composite profile derived at the Marine Science Institute (MSI, Galveston, Texas) from multichannel seismic data, shot primarily in the western part of the Gulf. The solid curve with circles is a profile derived by Gregory in a similar region using the percentage of shale in the sediment column to estimate velocity. Finally, the dashed curve was obtained by Matthews from a regression of interval velocities for seismic data obtained in an area of the Gulf of Mexico where the sediments are fine grained and highly consolidated due to rapid deposition.
FIGURE 2-5
SOME VELOCITY PROFILES OF THE GULF OF MEXICO FOUND IN THE LITERATURE
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Figure 2-6 shows how these profiles compare with the DSDP data. The MSI composite profile agrees very well with the DSDP data at hole 90 down to about 500 m (Fig. 2-6(a)). Below this depth, it is assumed that disturbance of the sample accounts for the unrealistically low DSDP velocities.

Figure 2-6(c) shows that the MSI profile does not agree with the DSDP data at hole 92 and that the Matthews profile underestimates the reported velocity at this site. This is believed due to the anomalously high consolidation of the sediments on the scarp at this site.

Finally, the DSDP measurements at hole 91, shown in Fig. 2-6(b), cannot be matched with the profiles shown in Fig. 2-5. The MSI and Gregory profiles coincide with some of the DSDP data at depths between 100 and 200 m and approximately agree with data points at about 400-500 m, but there is a distinct trend in the data toward sound speeds higher than sound speeds indicated by these profiles. The preliminary explanation of these higher sound speeds is that they are due to a higher coarse grain fraction (in particular sand) at this site than at hole 90. As seen in Fig. 2-2, the lithology at hole 90 is clay and silty clay to a depth of 500 m, whereas the lithology at hole 92 is silty clay, silty sand, and sand. Thus, a reasonable interpretation of the velocities at hole 91 would be a trend similar to that at hole 90 corresponding to the fine grain fraction, superimposed on a discontinuous profile with higher velocities corresponding to sediments with a considerable fraction of sand.

This explanation supports categorization of the Gulf of Mexico into two depositional regions: the Western Gulf, which is characterized by DSDP hole 90 and the MSI velocity profile, and the lower Mississippi Fan, which represents deposition of sediments with a higher coarse grain fraction. DSDP hole 91 seems to be in an overlap area of the two regions.
Figure 2-6: Comparison of velocity data obtained from DSOP measurements and velocity profiles found in the literature.

- DSOP Hole 92
- DSOP Hole 91
- DSOP Hole 90

Higher sound speeds due to sand.
The acoustical measurements discussed in this report appear to be in the zone of overlap of these two depositional regions. However, in the absence of other data, the velocity estimate obtained from the MSI composite profile was used in the acoustic analysis. This curve fits the DSDP data at hole 90 very well and appears to be a significant component of the overall velocity profile at hole 91. The sound speeds indicated by the Matthew's profile and DSDP data at hole 92 are probably not applicable to the acoustical measurements discussed in this report, although they are probably suitable for some regions of the Gulf.

Table 2-1 shows sound speeds and densities versus depth obtained from the MSI velocity profile. Densities were computed using the MSI velocity profile and the velocity-density relationships of Hamilton. Note that this sound speed profile shows a slightly "fast" bottom, with a sediment-water speed ratio of $1538/1530 = 1.005$. From the analysis of the acoustic bottom interaction data, it was concluded that the ratio should be $1516/1524 = 0.995$ (Table 4-1).
TABLE 2-1
VELOCITY AND DENSITY PROFILES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>MSI (m/sec)</th>
<th>Density* (g/cm³)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 -</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 +</td>
<td>1538</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>1729</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2351</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Calculated from MSI velocity profile using Hamilton’s velocity-density relationships.
CHAPTER 3
BOTTOM LOSS DATA

The processing procedure used to derive the bottom loss data is described in Ref. 1 and consists of three main steps. First, the total propagation loss for each multipath arrival is determined by comparing received energy in the pulse to the standard source level for the SUS. Next, using a coherence ray theory model and assuming a perfectly reflecting bottom, a reference loss for each arrival is calculated. The bottom loss calculated for each arrival is then assumed to be the difference between the reference and measured losses. Measurements are made in standard 1/3 octave bands from 25 Hz to 300 Hz.

The reduced data consisted of 48 SUS detonated at 91 m depth and 47 SUS at 244 m depth. The data used were recorded from a receiver at 2290 m depth.

The bottom loss data were limited to frequencies of 300 Hz or less, the bandwidth of the ACODAC. Exercise geometry restricted the bottom grazing angles of usable signal arrivals to between 7° and 38°. Short range SUS produced arrivals with grazing angles greater than 38°, but these saturated the receiver. The exercise conditions resulted in a problem for arrivals with low grazing angles (7° or less). The receiver was approximately 1110 m above the bottom. The sound speed profile (Figs. 1-2) indicates that bottom refraction can occur for sources deeper than 60 m; these paths also refract at the surface. The 244 m sources have more rays which refract rather than bounce from the surface than the 91 m shots. As a result, for 25 of the 244 m shots, bottom refracted arrivals were received within 0 to 150 msec prior to bottom bounce arrivals. These could not be time resolved, and contaminated bottom loss data below 14°. This situation occurred only four times for the 91 m shots and then disturbed data for bottom angles of less than 7°. Had the receiver been farther from the bottom, this problem would have been lessened.
Figures 3-1 - 3-5 are the per bounce bottom loss curves of five frequencies for the 244 m source. Figures 3-6 - 3-9 contain similar data for the 91 m sources. In these figures, each plotted symbol represents a bottom loss measurement from a single arrival. The plotted number denotes the number of bottom reflections of that arrival.

At 25 Hz and 50 Hz for the 91 m SUS and at 25 Hz for the 244 m SUS, the curves show complex behavior and have negative values over some angular intervals. Those are artifacts that arise from a combination of the acoustic surface interference effect ("Lloyd's mirror effect") and inaccurate source navigation.¹ Research is currently underway to circumvent this problem by estimating arrival angles from the data rather than from calculations based on navigation.² These low frequency bottom loss data can be interpreted as meaning that the loss is very low; actual values must be estimated from the higher frequency data, as will be done in Chapter 4.

Curves illustrating the per bounce bottom loss averaged over consecutive 5° bins are presented in Figs. 3-10 (91 m), 3-11 (244 m), and 3-12 (both sources). Note that the bottom loss scale is expanded. Because of the measurement artifact problems, the 25 Hz and 50 Hz data for the 91 m SUS and the 25 Hz data for the 244 m SUS are excluded. Comparing data from the two source depths (Figs. 3-10 and 3-11), one sees a close agreement of the estimates.

For both sources, bottom loss increases with frequency and bottom grazing angle. Mean bottom loss per bounce ranged from near 1 dB at 7° to approximately 2.5 dB at 38° for 50 Hz. Losses at 250 Hz rose from 4 dB at 7° to 5.7 dB at 38°.
FIGURE 3.1
50 Hz BOTTOM LOSS PER BOUNCE versus GRAZING ANGLE
FOR A 244 m SOURCE AND A 2290 m RECEIVER
FIGURE 3.2
100 Hz BOTTOM LOSS PER BOUNCE versus GRAZING ANGLE
FOR A 244 m SOURCE AND A 2290 m RECEIVER
FIGURE 3-3
160 Hz BOTTOM LOSS PER BOUNCE versus GRAZING ANGLE
FOR A 244 m SOURCE AND A 2290 m RECEIVER
FIGURE 3-4
200 Hz BOTTOM LOSS PER BOUNCE versus GRAZING ANGLE
FOR A 244 m SOURCE AND A 2290 m RECEIVER
FIGURE 3-5
250 Hz BOTTOM LOSS PER BOUNCE versus GRAZING ANGLE
FOR A 244 m SOURCE AND A 2290 m RECEIVER
FIGURE 3.6
100 Hz BOTTOM LOSS PER BOUNCE versus GRAZING ANGLE
FOR A 91 m SOURCE AND A 2290 m RECEIVER
FIGURE 3.7
160 Hz BOTTOM LOSS PER BOUNCE versus GRAZING ANGLE
FOR a 91 m SOURCE AND A 2290 m RECEIVER
FIGURE 3-8
200 Hz BOTTOM LOSS PER BOUNCE versus GRAZING ANGLE
FOR A 91 m SOURCE AND A 2290 m RECEIVER
FIGURE 3.9
250 Hz BOTTOM LOSS PER BOUNCE versus GRAZING ANGLE
FOR A 91 m SOURCE AND A 2290 m RECEIVER
FIGURE 3-10
AVERAGED BOTTOM LOSS PER BOUNCE versus GRAZING ANGLE
FOR A 244 m SOURCE AND A 2290 m RECEIVER
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FIGURE 3-11
AVERAGED BOTTOM LOSS PER BOUNCE versus GRAZING ANGLE
FOR A 91 m SOURCE AND A 2290 m RECEIVER
FIGURE 3-12
AVERAGED BOTTOM LOSS PER BOUNCE versus GRAZING ANGLE
FOR BOTH SOURCE DEPTHS AND A 2290 m RECEIVER
CHAPTER 4
GEOACOUSTIC MODEL OF WET TEST EXERCISE REGION

The second analysis objective was to determine how well the bottom loss measurements could be duplicated by theoretical models. This bottom interaction modeling is based on geoacoustical structure of the ocean bottom, in particular, that constructed by Hamilton.9 The model describes the bottom as a multilayered, fluid sediment on top of a solid, non-layered basement. Each layer is defined by a depth function of the geoacoustic parameters. This framework was used by Mitchell and Lemmon10 to develop a ray theory model of acoustic interaction with the ocean bottom. The following analysis is based upon this model. The parameters consist of the velocity and density profiles, attenuation profile, and the ratio of the sediment-to-water sound speeds ($c_s/c_w$) at the water-sediment interface.

As described in Chapter 2, an initial sound speed profile was obtained from analysis of archival data. Density data were derived from the velocity using Hamilton's density-velocity relationships.4 Then, an iterative series of bottom loss calculations and comparisons with data, followed by modifications to the geoacoustic model, were conducted. The objective here was to refine the $c_s/c_w$ ratio and to determine the attenuation profile.

The $c_s/c_w$ ratio was determined from the measured bottom loss data. This parameter strongly affects bottom loss at low grazing angles. Therefore, preliminary modeling results were compared to the measured loss to determine the best ratio. The value of 0.995 was selected and the velocity gradients, given in Chapter 2, were then used to calculate the velocity profile shown in Table 4-1.

To obtain the attenuation profile, the inversion technique of Ref. 9 was used. The resulting profile is shown in Fig. 4-1, and is tabulated in Table 4-1. Also shown
**TABLE 4-1**

GEOACOUSTIC PARAMETERS FOR THE SEDIMENT IN THE WET TEST EXERCISE AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Compressional Wave</th>
<th>Attenuation (dB/m-kHz)</th>
<th>Density (g/cm$^3$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bottom Water</td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1706</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>(0.012)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2327</td>
<td>(0.012)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Values in parenthesis were extrapolated.
FIGURE 4-1
COMPARISON OF ATTENUATION PROFILES FOR THE WET TEST SITE AND THE NORTHWEST INDIAN OCEAN
in Fig. 4-1 is the attenuation profile derived for thick sediment regions of the Northwest Indian Ocean.\textsuperscript{11} The attenuation data from the Mexican Basin Wet Test site closely match those labeled "M" (medium) from the Indian Ocean. As reported in Ref. 11, that region is known to have a silty clay bottom of terrigeneous origin with turbidite layering. A similar structure should be expected for the Wet Test region as discussed in Chapter 2.

Figures 4-2 - 4-6 compare the calculated and combined measured bottom loss. The figures illustrate very good agreement. Both measured and calculated values are averaged over 1/3 octave bands. Table 4-2 contains the calculated bottom losses for five frequencies and for grazing angles from $8^\circ$ to $36^\circ$.

This close match is important, as it allows extrapolations to the frequency and angle limits imposed by the measurement system.
FIGURE 4-2
COMPARISON OF CALCULATED (SOLID LINE) AND MEASURED (NUMBERS)
50 Hz BOTTOM LOSS PER BOUNCE versus GRAZING ANGLE
FIGURE 4-3
COMPARISON OF CALCULATED (SOLID LINE) AND MEASURED (NUMBERS)
100 Hz BOTTOM LOSS PER BOUNCE versus GRAZING ANGLE
FIGURE 4-4
COMPARISON OF CALCULATED (SOLID LINE) AND MEASURED (NUMBERS)
165 Hz BOTTOM LOSS PER BOUNCE versus GRAZING ANGLE
FIGURE 4-5
COMPARISON OF CALCULATED (SOLID LINE) AND MEASURED (NUMBERS)
200 Hz BOTTOM LOSS PER BOUNCE versus GRAZING ANGLE
FIGURE 4-6
COMPARISON OF CALCULATED (SOLID LINE) AND MEASURED (NUMBERS)
250 Hz BOTTOM LOSS PER BOUNCE versus GRAZING ANGLE
### TABLE 4-2
BOTTOM LOSSES CALCULATED BY A GEOACOUSTIC MODEL OF THE MEXICAN BASIN OF THE GULF OF MEXICO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grazing Angle (deg)</th>
<th>Bottom Loss (dB)</th>
<th>Frequency (Hz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Code 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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</tr>
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<table>
<thead>
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<th>Naval Research Laboratory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, D.C. 20375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attn:</td>
<td>Code 8100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commander</th>
<th>Naval Oceanographic Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSTL Station, Bay St. Louis, MS 39522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attn:</td>
<td>Code 7300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Code 9210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commanding Officer</th>
<th>Naval Research Laboratory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
<td>Orlando, FL 32806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attn:</td>
<td>Code 0277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Code 8280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Code 8289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naval Ocean Research and Development Activity</th>
<th>Liaison Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of the Navy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arlington, VA 22217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attn:</td>
<td>Code 130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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   DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for Public Release; Distribution is unlimited.

3. Questions may be directed to the undersigned on (703) 696-4619, DSN 426-4619.
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