

AD-A066 770 NAVY UNDERWATER SOUND LAB NEW LONDON CONN
A THREE LAYER FLUID MODEL FOR ESTIMATING OCEAN BOTTOM REFLECTIV--ETC(U)
JAN 63 B F COLE

F/G 17/1

UNCLASSIFIED

USL-TM-905-4-63

NL

| OF |
AD
A066770



002353

ADA066770

905-4-63
DDC FILE COPY

002353

SI GR
See - File

LEVEL II

This Copy For →

Copy 50 of Copies

USL Problem No. 1-001-01-00

(1)

U. S. NAVY UNDERWATER SOUND LABORATORY
FORT TRUMBULL, NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT

A THREE LAYER FLUID MODEL FOR ESTIMATING OCEAN BOTTOM
REFLECTIVITY AT VARIOUS FREQUENCIES.

By

Bernard F. Cole

Most Project

D D C

USL Technical Memorandum No. 7905-4-63

APR 3 1979

8 January 1963

Technical memo,

INTRODUCTION

(12) G30P.

F

The adoption of the bottom bounce mode of underwater sound propagation for sonar applications has made a consideration of ocean bottom sound reflectivity essential. The following discussion is an attempt to: (1) Relate observed ocean bottom physical and acoustic properties, and (2) present a better theoretical approach for comparison with existing measurements than those previously employed.

OCEAN BOTTOM PHYSICAL AND ACOUSTIC PROPERTIES

A physical analysis of shallow water sediments from the Pacific Ocean by Hamilton et al., (1956)¹ showed a correlation between the velocity and the density, between the velocity and the porosity, and between the velocity and the median grain size of the sediment layer. A general increase in velocity with increasing median grain size and density and decreasing porosity was noted. It is interesting and

¹Hamilton, E., Shumway, G., Menard, H., Shipek, C., "Acoustic and Other Physical Properties of Shallow Water Sediments," Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 28-1, 1 (January 1956).

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

to USNUSL Ser 963-235 of 4-15-63

254200

HP

perhaps significant that the same correlation was observed in a physical analysis of Atlantic deep sea sediment cores by Sutton, et al., (1957)². Although both studies showed a strong positive correlation to exist between the median grain size and the velocity, Sutton interpreted the median grain size as a factor directly affecting the velocity, while Hamilton explained the correlation as a result of the velocity-porosity relationship, and a strong negative correlation between the median grain size and the porosity.

Sutton found the compressional wave velocity in the ocean bottom unconsolidated sediments studied to be well represented by:

$$v' = 2.093 - (0.0414 \pm 0.0060) \phi + (0.00135 \pm 0.00038) Y - (0.44 \pm 0.15) \eta$$

where

v' = compressional wave velocity in km/sec.

ϕ = median grain size in phi units

Y = % of carbonate content³

η = porosity

Later sediment sound speed and absorption measurements by Shumway (1960)⁴ found the velocity to be related to the porosity, the rigidity, the pressure, the temperature, and the compressibility of the grain aggregate, and correlated the absorption with the porosity and the median grain size. Shumway also found the absorption to vary with the frequency raised to the 1.79 ± 0.98^5 power.

²Sutton, G., Berckheimer, H., Nafe, J., "Physical Analysis of Deep Sea Sediments," Geophysics, 24-4, 779 (October 1957).

³Sutton also found a positive correlation between the carbonate content and the velocity.

⁴Shumway, G., "Sound Speed and Absorption Studies of Marine Sediments by a Resonance Method" - Parts I and II, Geophysics, 25, 451 and 659 (1960).

⁵0.98 is the standard deviation.

ACCESSION NO.	
NTS	White Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
BIG	Buff Section <input type="checkbox"/>
UNANNOUNCED	
JUSTIFICATION <i>Part Lateral</i>	
ON FILE	
BY	
DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODES	
DISL	AVAIL. AND/OR SPECIAL
A	

The variation of sediment velocity, porosity and density with depth in the sediment has been considered by both Hamilton (1959)⁶ and Nafe and Drake (1957)⁷. Nafe and Drake (1961)⁸ have also written an excellent summary of various studies involving sediment physical properties, which include all the previously mentioned studies.

In an attempt to find some correlation between sonar bottom loss measurements and bottom composition, sediment cores from the Atlantic were compared with bottom loss measurements according to geographic position. The results obtained from this comparison indicated that areas containing sand layers generally provide very good reflectivity, while areas containing only silt or clay layers provide average to poor reflectivity.⁹ These observations are consistent with those of other studies: Liebermann (1948)¹⁰ designated mud as the poorest reflector; Ewing et al., (1960)¹¹ found indications that silt is a poor reflector; Moore (1960)¹²

⁶Hamilton, E. L., "Thickness and Consolidation of Deep Sea Sediments", Bulletin of the Geological Society of America, 70-11, 1399 (November 1959).

⁷Nafe, J. E., Drake, C. L., "Variation with Depth in Shallow and Deep Water Marine Sediments of Porosity, Density, and the Velocities of Compressional and Shear Waves", Geophysics, 22-3, 523 (July 1957).

⁸Nafe, J. E., Drake, C. L., "Physical Properties of Marine Sediments", Lamont Geological Observatory Technical Report No. 2 (June 1961).

⁹Remarks of Mr. T. G. Bell from "Proceedings of Conference on Sound Reflection from the Sea Bottom", AVCO Marine Electronics Dept./ Lamont Geological Observatory Report #MED-62-1019, p 24 (January 1962).

¹⁰Liebermann, L. N., "Reflection of Sound from Coastal Sea Bottoms", Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 20, 35 (1948).

¹¹Ewing, J., Luskin, B., Roberts, A., and Hirshman, J., "Sub Bottom Reflection Measurements on the Continental Shelf, Bermuda Banks, West Indies Arc, and in the West Atlantic Basins", Journal of Geophysical Research, 65-9, 2849 (September 1960).

¹²Moore, D. G., "Acoustic Reflection Studies of the Continental Shelf and Slope Off Southern California", Bulletin of the Geological Society of America, 71-8, 1121 (1960).

observed that clean sand is the hardest to penetrate acoustically, while silty clays are most easily penetrated; Smith (1960)¹³ noticed reflection from sand, but penetration of silt and clay; Mackenzie (1960)¹⁴ indicated that sand is a good reflector; Davidian (1961)¹⁵ showed high reflection losses over a silt bottom; Hasse (1961)¹⁶ concluded that bottom loss for sand bottoms in shallow water is appreciably less than that for mud bottoms, and McClure et al., (1958)¹⁷ experienced good reflection from sand layers at 3.8 kc.

From the above discussed correlation between the median grain size and the velocity, and between the median grain size and the reflectivity, we would expect also a correlation between the sediment reflectivity and the sediment velocity. Such a correlation has been observed. Fry (1960)¹⁸ and Fry and Raitt (1961)¹⁹ have found that low velocity sediments provide poor reflectivity, while Katz and Ewing (1960)²⁰, by obtaining good sub-bottom reflections in certain areas, have indicated good penetration of such layers. A more complete discussion of this low-velocity layer is furnished by Ewing and Nafe (1961)²¹.

¹³Smith, W. O., "Recent Underwater Surveys Using Low Frequency Sound to Locate Shallow Bedrock", Bulletin of the Geological Society of America, 69-1 (1958).

¹⁴Mackenzie, K.V., "Reflection of Sound from Coastal Bottoms", Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 32-2, 221 (February 1960).

¹⁵Davidian, M., "Sounding Intensity Study Off Green Cay in Tongue of the Ocean", Report of NRL Progress, (November 1961).

¹⁶Hasse, R., Jr., "COLOSSUS II Summary Report", USL Report No. 513 (July 1961) (Confidential).

¹⁷McClure, C. D., Nelson, H. F., Huckabay, W. B., "Marine Sonoprobe System, New Tool for Geologic Mapping", Bulletin of American Association of Petroleum Geologist, 701 (1958).

¹⁸Fry, J. C., "The Reflection of Sound from the Deep Sea Floor", USAG Journal, 11-2 (April 1961).

¹⁹Fry, J. C., Raitt, R. W., "Sound Velocities at the Surface of Deep Sea Sediments", Journal of Geophysical Research, 66-2, 589 (February 1961)

²⁰Katz, S., Ewing, M., "Seismic-Refraction Measurements in the Atlantic Ocean Part VII Atlantic Ocean Basin, West of Bermuda", Bulletin of the Geological Society of America, 67-4, 475 (1960).

²¹Ewing, J., Nafe, J., "The Unconsolidated Sediments", Lamont Geological Observatory Technical Report No. 3 (June 1961).

THEORETICAL BOTTOM REFLECTIVITY

Previous investigations involving ocean bottom reflectivity have included theoretical analysis as well as experimental observations. Fry²² compared his calculated sediment reflection coefficients with the Rayleigh reflection coefficients for different sediments, and Hamilton²³ used the Mackenzie form of the Rayleigh equation to calculate the reflection loss for a number of sediments. Mackenzie (1960)²⁴ later presented a modified Rayleigh expression, which R. W. Morse had derived, to consider attenuation in the bottom fluid. This modified Rayleigh expression also appeared in USL Report No. 255 (1955)²⁵ in a different form, and was extended to consider two fluid layers, the second again containing attenuation, over a rigid bottom layer.

The USL Report No. 255 extension of the Rayleigh expression was rederived, as an initial effort of the work reported in the present paper, to clarify the form of the equation and was programmed in Fortran.²⁶ From the resultant calculations, it was evident that a further extension to a model consisting of three fluid layers of finite impedance would be useful.

The expression for the reflection amplitude coefficient was derived for the three-layer model²⁷, assuming absorption and a finite velocity in both the second and third layers, and was programmed for an IBM 704 computer. Bottom loss computations were then performed using typical sediment velocities, densities and absorptions for comparison with bottom loss measurements. In performing these calculations, the first layer was always assumed to be water of

²²See Footnotes 18 and 19.

²³See Footnote 1.

²⁴See Footnote 14.

²⁵Schulkin, M., Thorp, W., Study D—"Report on the Status of Project AMOS (Acoustical, Meteorological and Oceanographic Survey)(1 Jan 53-31 Dec 1954)", USL Report No. 255 (March 1955) (Confidential).

²⁶Cole, B. F., Bell, T. G., "Three Layer Fluid Model for Ocean Bottom Reflectivity", USL Technical Memorandum No. 905-55-62 (December 1962)

²⁷See Footnote 26.

a constant velocity and density, the second layer was always assumed to be a fairly transparent, low-velocity sediment (clay or silt) of varying thickness, and the third layer was always assumed to be a fairly firm, high velocity sediment (silt or sand). Such assumptions concerning the penetration and reflectivity of various types of sediment are believed justifiable according to the experimental observations previously discussed.

Theoretical losses computed for a silt-over-sand bottom are compared with Mackenzie's 1 kc bottom loss measurements²⁸ in Figure 1. Theoretical curves were computed for various layer thicknesses, and the thickness providing the best curve fit to the data was chosen. This comparison indicates that the three-layer fluid model is able to predict the low scatter of losses for grazing angles less than twenty degrees, and yet account for the high scatter of losses for grazing angles greater than twenty degrees.

The good agreement obtained between measured and theoretical bottom loss curves has prompted the presentation of theoretical curves for various frequencies, bottom types, and layer thicknesses (see Figures 2-24). The theoretical curves presented in Figures 2-8 were computed for a frequency study using the same sediment constants, and varying only the absorption coefficients in the second and third layers to correspond to the variation in frequency.²⁹ The effect of layer depth on the theoretical bottom loss for various frequencies and various sediment constants is shown by Figures 9-24. These figures also provide some indication of the variation in bottom loss with changing sediment constants at a given frequency.

Although only one example of measured versus theoretical bottom loss is included in this paper, extensive comparisons of classified experimental^{30, 31} and theoretical bottom losses, omitted for purposes of classification³², have shown fairly good agreement, and indicate that this theory will provide a good approximation of ocean bottom reflectivity.

BERNARD F. COLE

Bernard F. Cole

²⁸See Footnote 14.

²⁹Various relations between the attenuation and the frequency were assumed, however, a linear variation in attenuation with variation in frequency provided the best fit to data ranging from 125 cps to 4 kc.

³⁰See Footnote 14.

³¹BRASS II experimental data (unpublished).

³²This report was originally written as a co-op report for Northeastern University, and hence necessarily unclassified.

APPENDIX A

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Density: $\frac{\text{wet weight of sediment}}{\text{total volume of sample}}$

Porosity: Ratio of volume of voids (sea water in this case) between the grains of a sediment sample to the total volume of the sediment.

Sand, Silt and Clay: Wentworth grade scale of particle diameter, i.e., sand 2 - 0.062 mm, silt 0.062 - 0.004 mm, and clay less than 0.004 mm.

Theoretical Reflection Loss in DB/Reflection = $20 \log_{10}$ reflection amplitude coefficient.

THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDO




FIGURE 1.

30

28

26

24

22

20

18

16

14

12

10

8

6

4

2

0

BOTTOM LOSS IN DB





FIGURE 2.


THEORETICAL CURVE 0.125 KC


Layer 1	$C_1 = 4990$	$\alpha_{C_1} = 0$
	$\varphi_1 = 1.050$	
Layer 2	$C_2 = 4850$	$\alpha_{C_2} = 0.000687$
	$\varphi_2 = 1.338$	$D = 150^\circ$
Layer 3	$C_3 = 5100$	$\alpha_{C_3} = 0.017000$
	$\varphi_3 = 1.860$	


BOTTOM GAZING ANGLE IN DEGREES



THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO DDC














FIGURE 7.





THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO EDC
























FIGURE-16.












FIGURE 21.

