



**LEVEL II**

BS  
**2**

# **FLOW RESEARCH COMPANY**

**A DIVISION OF FLOW INDUSTRIES, INC.**

AD A103179

FILE COPY



**HEADQUARTERS**  
21414 - 88th Avenue South  
Kent, Washington 98031 (206) 872-8500  
Seattle Ex. 622-1500 TWX 910-447-2782

**DTIC**  
**ELECTE**  
AUG 24 1981  
**S** **D**  
**D**

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A**  
Approved for public release;  
Distribution Unlimited

81 7 17 084

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By <u>Per Ltr. on file</u>	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
<b>A</b>	-

**LEVEL II**

*2*

*14* | *FLR RR-165*

*9* Flow Research Report No. 165 ✓

*6* Beaufort Sea Ice Mechanical Energy Budget 1975 - 76

Contract NO0014-79-C-0147

*15*

By

*1* D. R./Thomas  
R. S./Pritchard

*12-11*

*1* August 1980

Flow Research Company  
A Division of Flow Industries, Inc.  
21414 - 68th Avenue South  
Kent, Washington 98031  
(206) 872 - 8500

DTIC ELECTE  
S AUG 24 1981 D

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A  
Approved for public release;  
Distribution Unlimited

*390409*

*U*

Acknowledgment

The authors thank Dr. Max Coon for his valuable comments suggesting the approach taken in this paper. The work was sponsored by the Office of Naval Research under contract number N00014-79-C-0147.

Table of Contents

	Page
List of Figures	ii
1. Introduction	1
2. Mechanical Energy Budget	3
3. Data	7
4. Observed Energy Transfer from Atmosphere to Ice to Ocean	11
5. Dissipation of Energy by Sea Ice	20
6. Comparison of Acoustic Data with Energy Dissipated	24
7. Conclusions	30
References	32
Appendix A. Elastic-Plastic Material Model	35

List of Figures

	Page
Figure 1. Bar Graph Showing When Ice Velocity Data Are Available at Each Station (Heavy Line). Hydrophone Data Was Obtained at Some Stations for Periods Indicated by Double Thin Lines. Day 121 is May 1, 1975.	8
Figure 2. Location of Operative Data Buoys, Midwinter 1975-76. Buoys Marked with Solid Circles Collected Acoustic Data as well as Position and Atmospheric Pressure.	9
Figure 3. Time History of $p_a$ (—), $p_w$ (.....) and $P_{afd}$ (.....) at Station 10.	12
Figure 4a. Time History of 31-Day Moving Average of Power Input from the Atmosphere. Individual Curves Represent Different Locations and the Heavy Dotted Curve is the Mean of all Stations.	14
Figure 4b. Time History of 31-Day Moving Average of Power Input to the Ocean. Individual Curves Represent Different Locations and the Heavy Dotted Curve is the Mean of all Stations.	15
Figure 4c. Time History of 31-Day Moving Average of Free Drift Power Available. Individual Curves Represent Different Locations and the Heavy Dotted Curve is the Mean of all Stations.	16
Figure 5a. Daily Average Values of Power Input from the Atmosphere $p_a$ ( $mW/m^2$ ). Vertical Scale is Percentage of Observations During the Season at all Locations.	17
Figure 5b. Daily Average Values of Power Input to the Ocean $p_w$ ( $mW/m^2$ ). Vertical Scale is Percentage of Observations During the Season at all Locations.	18
Figure 5c. Daily Average Values of Free Drift Power Available $P_{afd}$ ( $mW/m^2$ ). Vertical Scale is Percentage of Observations During the Season at all Locations.	19
Figure 6. Daily Average Wintertime (Jan-Mar) Values of Rate of Energy Dissipated by Ice ( $p_d$ ) for 33 Locations in Beaufort Sea, - Computed Using Observed Ice Motions and Modeled Stresses.	23
Figure 7. Time History of 10 Hz, 1/3 Octave Spectral Band of Sound Intensity at Station 10.	12
Figure 8a. Daily Average Values of Normalized 10 Hz Sound Intensity. Vertical Scale is Percentage of Observations During the Season at all Locations.	26

List of Figures (Cont.)

	Page
Figure 8b. Daily Average Values of 1000 Hz Sound Intensity. Vertical Scale is Percentage of Observations During the Season at all Locations.	27
Figure 9. Time History of 31-Day Moving Average; All Stations, for 10 Hz Normalized Sound Intensity.	28
Figure A.1. Sea Ice Yield Surface. The Axes are Stress Invariants: $\sigma_I = 1/2 \text{ tr } \sigma$ and $\sigma_{II} = (1/2 \text{ tr } \sigma' \sigma')^{1/2}$ where $\sigma' = \sigma - \sigma_I \mathbf{1}$ is the Deviatoric Stress. The Diamond-Shaped Surface is Visualized by Rotating the Curve Around the Abscissa, which Represents Independence of the Direction of the Principal Stress.	35

## 1. Introduction

The mechanical energy budget of the Arctic sea ice cover has only recently been studied. Knowledge of this energy budget helps us understand better the processes by which energy is transferred between the atmosphere and the ocean. The mechanical energy budget provides simple scalar variables that are useful for quantifying sea ice dynamic events. For example, the history of energy transferred to the ice by winds is a useful indicator of the strength of storms. Although energy transfers cannot be observed directly as can be velocity or other kinematic variables, the energy variables are useful when verifying and tuning ice dynamics models.

Long-term observations of sea ice motions in the Beaufort Sea show the general pattern to be a clockwise gyre centered at about  $76^{\circ}\text{N}$ ,  $145^{\circ}\text{W}$  with a period of up to 10 years. Superimposed upon this trend are a great deal of smaller perturbations. Thorndike and Colony (1980) have looked at the spectral density of velocity measurements at stations located on the ice. Spectral distributions of velocity are strongly weighted toward lower frequencies. Energy falls off rapidly at roughly a 5-day period. Coon and Pritchard (1979) developed the equation of balance of mechanical energy by forming the inner product of the ice velocity and the ice momentum-balance equation. Pritchard et al. (1979) used the energy balance concept to describe spatial and temporal variations in the energy budget during a 17-day simulation of the Beaufort Sea ice motion using the AIDJEX model. Comparisons of model results and observed atmospheric and oceanic energies were made.

Noise under the ice in the Arctic Ocean has also been observed and recorded. The background noise is thought to be due to wind-blown snow, the breaking of ice by thermal stresses, and the breaking, sliding, and crushing of ice during ridge building. Ridging seems to dominate other noise sources. Seasonal differences have been observed in noise levels (Greene and Buck, 1977). Correlations between noise level and winds are significant (Greene and Buck, 1978) but explain only between one-third to one-half of the variation. Correlations between noise and wind speed squared are somewhat better (C. R. Greene, personal communication).

In this report, we present and describe the mechanical energy budget of the Beaufort Sea for one year (during the AIDJEX main experiment, 1975-76). We also present some preliminary evidence to verify the conjecture that the energy dissipated in the deformation of the ice cover is related to the background noise level.

-3-

## 2. Mechanical Energy Budget

Coon and Pritchard (1979) formulated a mechanical energy balance for sea ice by forming the inner product of the momentum-balance equation and the ice velocity. The local form of this mechanical energy balance can be written as a balance between the time rate of change of kinetic energy (areal) density  $\dot{k}$  and the rate of energy transfer (areal) from the atmosphere  $p_a$  to the ocean  $p_w$  and the ice  $p_i$  :

$$\dot{k} = p_a - p_w - p_i . \quad (1)$$

All energy transfer rates were computed as daily, averaged energy transfers per unit area. For brevity we shall use the term "energy transfer rate." The kinetic energy density of the ice cover is

$$k = 1/2 m \underline{v}^t \underline{v} , \quad (2)$$

where  $m$  is areal mass density,  $\underline{v}$  is the ice velocity, and  $\underline{v}^t$  is the transpose of  $\underline{v}$ . The rate of energy transfer from the atmosphere

$$p_a = \underline{v}^t \underline{\tau}_a \quad (3)$$

is the rate at which energy is transferred from the atmosphere to the top surface of the ice due to the air drag  $\underline{\tau}_a$ . The rate of energy transfer to the ocean is similarly

$$p_w = -\underline{v}^t \left[ \underline{\tau}_w - mg \nabla H \right] , \quad (4)$$

where  $\underline{\tau}_w$  is the water drag,  $\nabla H$  represents sea surface tilt, and  $g$  is the gravitational acceleration. Negative values of  $p_w$  imply that the ocean currents are driving the ice. The oceanic energy transfer rate  $p_w$  has been decomposed by Pritchard et al. (1979) into the rate of energy transfer to the ocean due to water drag  $\underline{\tau}_w$  and the rate of change of gravitational potential energy due to sea surface tilt

$$p_w = p_o + p_g , \quad (5)$$

where 
$$p_o = -\tilde{v}^t \tilde{T}_w \quad (6)$$

and 
$$p_g = \tilde{v}^t mg \nabla H . \quad (7)$$

The remaining term in the mechanical energy balance equation (Equation (1))  $p_i$  represents the influence of internal ice stress on the transfer of energy from the atmosphere to the ocean

$$p_i = -\tilde{v}^t (\nabla \cdot \tilde{\sigma}) , \quad (8)$$

which can in turn be separated into two parts

$$p_i = -p_f + p_d , \quad (9)$$

where 
$$p_f = \nabla \cdot (\tilde{v}^t \tilde{\sigma}) \quad (10)$$

is the divergence of the stress flux (i.e., the rate of energy transfer horizontally through the ice) and

$$p_d = \text{tr } \tilde{\sigma} \tilde{D} \quad (11)$$

is the trace of the product of stress and stretching or the rate at which energy is dissipated by the internal stress through deformations. For the elastic-plastic model used in this work (see Appendix A),  $p_d$  may be either stored as recoverable or elastic strain energy  $U_e = \text{tr } \tilde{\sigma} \tilde{\epsilon}$  or dissipated by plastic deformation  $p_\ell = \text{tr } \tilde{\sigma} \tilde{D}_p$ . The quantities are related by

$$p_d = \dot{U}_e + p_\ell . \quad (\text{A.6 bis})$$

Our approach in this work is to approximate  $p_d$  by  $p_\ell$ , the difference  $\dot{U}_e$  being small as shown in Appendix A. The term  $\dot{U}_e$  is considered an error term which can be arbitrarily small.

The term  $p_d$  represents the rate of energy storage or dissipation in the ice cover. Dissipation occurs when ice blocks slide along one

-5-

another (friction), when ice floes break, and when ice blocks are piled into ridges (increase in potential energy). Observers have noted that ridge building is accompanied by a great deal of noise and is the largest source of noise in the central Arctic pack (B. M. Buck, personal communication). Thus, a majority of the noise energy in the Arctic is a by-product of the ice deformation.

Three of the terms in the energy balance given in Equation (1) may be computed directly from observed data. These are  $\dot{k}$ ,  $p_a$ , and  $p_w$  (or  $p_o$  and  $p_g$ ). Changes in kinetic energy involve only observed ice thickness and ice velocity. Energy input from the atmosphere depends upon ice velocity, geostrophic or surface winds, and a drag law. The quadratic law in terms of geostrophic winds  $\underline{U}$  is

$$\underline{\tau}_a = \rho_a C_a |\underline{U}| \underline{A} \underline{U} \quad (12)$$

$$\underline{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \alpha & -\sin \alpha \\ \sin \alpha & \cos \alpha \end{pmatrix}.$$

where  $\rho_a C_a = 0.035 \text{ kg/m}^3$  and  $\alpha = 24^\circ$  are typical values (Leavitt et al., 1978; M. Albright, personal communication). The energy transfer rate to the ocean depends upon ice velocity and mass, geostrophic currents, and an oceanic drag law. A quadratic form of the drag law is again used

$$\underline{\tau}_w = \rho_w C_w |\underline{v} - \underline{v}_g| \underline{B} (\underline{v} - \underline{v}_g) \quad (13)$$

$$\underline{B} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos (\pi + \beta) & -\sin (\pi + \beta) \\ \sin (\pi + \beta) & \cos (\pi + \beta) \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\rho_w C_w = 5.5 \text{ kg/m}^3$  and  $\beta = 23^\circ$ . The parameters  $C_w$  and  $\beta$  have been experimentally determined, and the form of the drag law has been tested (McPhee, 1980). The geostrophic ocean current  $\underline{v}_g$  is approximated by the long-term mean flow according to Newton's (1973) dynamic topography.

Since all except one of the terms in Equation (1) may be calculated from observed data, the rate at which energy is transferred into the

ice  $p_i$  can be computed as a residual of the other terms. However,  $p_d$  and  $p_f$ , which are combined in  $p_i$ , cannot be computed directly from observed data since the ice stress cannot be measured directly. A material model of the ice is required in order to determine the stress and compute the energy dissipation rate  $p_d$ .

In order to quantify the wind energy available, we have computed the maximum possible transfer rate of energy from the atmosphere to the ice and the ocean. This maximum transfer occurs when ice stresses are zero and the ice moves freely with the wind. Energy from the atmosphere is transferred to the ice at the rate  $p_{afd}$ , and then through the ice into the ocean at the rate  $p_{wfd}$ , or it goes into changing the kinetic energy  $\dot{k}_{fd}$ :

$$\dot{k}_{fd} = p_{afd} - p_{wfd} \quad (14)$$


### 3. Data


Computation of the terms in the mechanical energy budget requires knowledge of the ice velocity, surface winds, and ocean currents, as well as the internal ice stress. The ice stress cannot be measured directly, but stresses can be modeled using a complete ice dynamics model driven by winds and currents (Coon et al., 1974; Pritchard, 1980; Hibler, 1980) or by using observed strain history in the constitutive laws (Rothrock et al., 1980). During the AIDJEX main experiment from 1975-76 a vast quantity of data about the ice in the Beaufort Sea was collected. Satellite-tracked buoys were used to determine ice motions. Buoy data processing and ice motions have been described by Thorndike and Cheung (1977). Part of the processing involved smoothing the position data to reduce the satellite positioning error. As a result, much of the higher frequency motion (in less than a 24-hour period) is attenuated. Thorndike and Colony (1980) have shown that most of the ice deformation occurs at low frequencies. Since we are only concerned with time scales of a day or greater in this study, we performed additional filtering of the ice motion data to remove all frequencies greater than one day.

In Figure 1 we show the amount of buoy position data used in this study, and in Figure 2 we show the approximate location of each buoy on January 30, 1976. In addition to position, each of these buoys measured barometric pressure. From the derived pressure maps, geostrophic wind fields were calculated for the Beaufort Sea (Albright, 1980). The surface traction exerted on the upper side of the ice is related to the geostrophic flow (Brown, 1976) by Equation (12). To be consistent with ice motion data, atmospheric surface traction fields  $\tau_a$  were computed every 6 hours and then filtered to get daily average values.

Seasonal values of the mean ice thickness  $\bar{h}$  are computed by Thorndike et al. (1975). A comparison of the April value of  $\bar{h}$  as measured by an under-ice sonar profile (Wadhams and Horne, 1978) agrees with the tabulated value within 5 percent.

Noise data were also collected at eight of the buoy stations (those marked with solid dots in Figure 2). Sound pressure levels are available (Burke and Buck, 1975). These are values for 1/3 octave bands centered upon 3.2, 10, 32.0, and 1000 Hz (at one station 100 Hz instead of 3.2 Hz was sensed). Pressure histories sensed by hydrophones were filtered





**Figure 2. Location of Operative Data Buoys, Midwinter 1975-76. Buoys Marked With Solid Circles Collected Acoustic Data As Well As Position and Atmospheric Pressure.**

into 1/3 octave bands, averaged over 45 second intervals, and then sampled each 3 hours. The 3.2 Hz signal has been noted to be contaminated by self noise from the hydrophone (Greene and Buck, 1977) and has therefore not been included in this study. It is traditional that acoustic data are presented as logarithms of the pressure (or intensity) normalized by a reference value. However, to make a comparison between observed noise levels and the energy budget components, we present all data in a linear scale rather than a logarithmic scale. We also focus on the intensity of the acoustic signal, rather than the pressure, because it is the desired measure of energy in the signal.

#### 4. Observed Energy Transfer from Atmosphere to Ice to Ocean

At each station a time history of the daily average rate of energy density transferred from the atmosphere to the ice  $p_a$  and between the ice and the ocean  $p_w$  is computed. Also, the energy transfer rate from the atmosphere to the ice assuming no internal ice stress  $p_{afd}$  is computed, in which case all the atmospheric energy is transferred through the ice and into the ocean. This term is useful as a measure of the maximum energy available to move and deform the ice. The changes in kinetic energy from day to day  $\dot{k}$  is also computed at each station. This term is less than  $1 \text{ mW/m}^2$  and is therefore insignificant when compared to other terms in the energy balance. Evaluating  $\dot{k}$  and showing it to be negligible proves that the energy budget may be assumed to be quasistatic on 1 day resolution. The change in potential energy due to sea surface tilt is also negligible. The variable  $p_g$  is usually less than  $1 \text{ mW/m}^2$  and always less than about  $5 \text{ mW/m}^2$ . Therefore, the rate of energy transfer to the ocean  $p_w$  is nearly equal to the energy transferred via water drag  $p_o$ .

Figure 3 shows that time histories of energy transfer rates are characterized by events of 3 to 7 days duration followed by quiet periods of approximately the same length. These events are atmospheric storms passing over the Beaufort Sea. The  $p_{afd}$  term is a useful measure of the intensity of storms since it amplifies the winds ( $p_{afd}$  is roughly proportional to  $U^3$ , the wind speed cubed). Note that computation of  $p_{afd}$  requires only the observed winds and  $p_a$  uses the observed winds and the observed ice motion, whereas  $p_w$  is calculated from only the observed ice motion. Thus two independent data sets are used. Even though the data sets are independent, there are strong similarities between the traces of  $p_a$ ,  $p_w$ , and  $p_{afd}$ . Peaks occur simultaneously and shapes are similar in period and phase. This gives confidence that winds and motions are accurate.

The difference in the history of  $p_a$  and  $p_w$  is  $p_i$ , the rate at which energy is transferred horizontally through the ice or dissipated by ice deformation. The effect of ice stress is seen to increase during winter when ice strength is high. This is seen in both  $p_i$  and in  $p_{afd} - p_w$ , the effect of ice stress on the rate of energy transfer into the ocean.




Figure 3. Time History of  $p_g$  (—) and  $p_w$  (.....) at Station 10.




Figure 7. Time history of 10 Hz, 1/3 Octave Spectral Band of Sound Intensity at Station 10.

For reasons of space, we do not present time histories for all stations but note that all look similar. However, two kinds of spatial variability were evident in the plots. Peaks at widely separated locations may differ in magnitude partly due to spatial scales which are about the same size as the atmospheric low pressure system. Also, a frequent temporal shift of a day or two in the peaks at different locations can be caused by a storm moving across the study area.

The data ( $p_a$ ,  $p_w$ , and  $p_{afd}$ ) from each station with records longer than 60 days were put through a 31-day boxcar filter. The resultant month-long averages for all stations are plotted together in Figure 4 along with the mean of all stations. This figure displays both the spatial variability across the Beaufort Sea and the long-term seasonal trends of the energy transfer rates. Much of the time, the total spatial variations in  $p_a$ ,  $p_w$ , and  $p_{afd}$  are within 2 to 3  $\text{mW/m}^2$  or about 20 to 40 percent of the mean value. At other times when variability is large, only two or three stations are causing the increase in spatial variability. In any case, the spatial average is descriptive of time histories at each site. A definite seasonal variation can be seen. There is a maximum in late summer, that remains fairly high. Another peak occurs in late November and early December, then decreases through spring and early summer. Generally the spatial variation is less than the seasonal trends.

As a further illustration of seasonal differences in  $p_a$ ,  $p_w$ , and  $p_{afd}$ , we present in Figure 5 histograms of daily average energy transfer rates for 3-month periods. Histograms were not done for spatial variation because of lack of data points. Bin sizes in all these histograms are  $5 \text{ mW/m}^2$ . The first bin contains the background signal, those days with little or no wind and ice motion. The last bin (shaded) contains all values greater than  $50 \text{ mW/m}^2$ . The three sets of histograms are very similar. The summer months (July, August, September) show the most activity with fall and winter (October through March) similar to each other and having intermediate activity. Spring (April, May, June) has the least activity.




Figure 4a. Time History of 31-Day Moving Average of Power Input from the Atmosphere. Individual Curves Represent Different Locations and the Heavy Dotted Curve is the Mean of all Stations.





Figure 4b. Time History of 31-Day Moving Average of Power Input to the Ocean. Individual Curves Represent Different Locations and the Heavy Dotted Curve is the Mean of all Stations.



**Figure 4c. Time History of 31-Day Moving Average of Free Drift Power Available. Individual Curves Represent Different Locations and the Heavy Dotted Curve is the Mean of all Stations.**




Figure 5a. Daily Average Values of Power Input from the Atmosphere  $p_a$  ( $mW/m^2$ ). Vertical Scale is Percentage of Observations During the Season at all Locations.




Figure 5b. Daily Average Values of Power Input to the Ocean  $P_w$  ( $mW/m^2$ ). Vertical Scale is Percentage of Observations During the Season at all Locations.




Figure 5c. Daily Average Values of Free Drift Power Available  $p_{afd}$  ( $mW/m^2$ ). Vertical Scale is Percentage of Observations During the Season at all Locations.

##### 5. Dissipation of Energy by Sea Ice

From Equation (1) we see that we can easily compute  $p_i = p_a - p_w$ , the net rate of energy transfer into the ice cover. But the energy transferred into the ice can either be transferred horizontally into some other region by the ice stress divergence or dissipated by deformation of the ice cover. As a result, more information about the stress field is needed to separate  $p_i$  into these two components. Thus, either the net horizontal energy transfer rate into or out of a region  $p_f$  (the divergence of stress flux) or the rate of energy dissipated by ice deformation inside the region  $p_d$  must be computed directly in order to describe completely the mechanical energy balance for a region. To compute either of these terms, the internal stresses in the ice must be known. Since these large-scale stresses cannot be measured directly, some form of ice model is needed to estimate the stress from the deformation and divergence properties of the ice.

The deformation history may be used directly as input to the constitutive law (see Appendix A) to calculate the stress history. From this pair of variables the rate of energy dissipation by plastic deformation  $p_\rho$  is calculated directly as an approximation to  $p_d$ . In the full AIDJEX ice model, described in Appendix A, the strength parameter  $p^*$  is computed from the ice thickness distribution. During most of the time period of this study we have inadequate data on the actual ice thickness distribution. Fortunately, during parts of the year this is not a critical factor. McPhee (1980) has shown that during the summer of 1975, the ice was usually in a state of free drift, i.e., the stresses were negligible. During the depths of winter, Pritchard (1980) has shown that the ice strength is very high. Some spatial and temporal variation will be lost by assuming the strength to be constant and everywhere high. During the fall, when ice is growing on the large amounts of open water, or in the spring, when ice is melting and new areas of open water are being produced, the variations in ice strength are likely to be much greater than in the winter or summer. We therefore decided to consider only the summer and winter periods when looking at the  $p_d$  term.

During the winter then, the simplified version of the AIDJEX model is used in which strain rates are computed from observed velocities at three locations forming a triangle. The strain rates were used to compute stresses, assuming a constant ice strength of  $p^* = 10^5$  N/m. The energy dissipated by the ice in plastic deformation ( $p_d = \text{tr } \underline{\underline{\sigma}} \underline{\underline{D}}_p$ ) is computed since both  $\underline{\underline{D}}_p$  is available from data and  $\underline{\underline{\sigma}}$  can be calculated from the model.

Thorndike and Colony (1977) have demonstrated that estimates of the deformation gradient from the velocity of a few floes are subject to large error. They argue that discontinuities in motion between floes are large enough that the smooth velocity field (on length scales of 100 km) accounts for only about two-thirds of the variations. By fitting locally linear surfaces to the velocity field, and measuring errors in this fit, standard deviations of the linear and nonlinear contributions to the velocity field are calculated, as shown in Table 1. Daily averages are considered in all cases.

Table 1. Estimated Variability of Daily Velocity Over 100 km. Tabulated Values are Estimated RMS Values with 90 Percent Confidence.

<u>Time</u>	<u>Linear Component km/day</u>	<u>Nonlinear Component</u>
May 1 - Jun 29, 1975	1.0	0.4
Jul 30 - Sep 17, 1975	1.6	1.0


Interpreting the results presented in Table 1, we must conclude that deformations calculated by fitting a plane through the velocity values at the three vertices of a triangle of 100-km size may be in error by as much as 0.8 percent per day in May and June 1975 and by as much as 2.0 percent per day during August and September 1975. To estimate the history of  $p_d$ , Equation (11), we use the deformation  $\underline{\underline{D}}$  to calculate the stress state  $\underline{\underline{\sigma}}$ . Uncertainties in deformations due to the nonlinear variations introduce uncertainties into the stress state that are large enough to move the stress anywhere on the yield surface (see Appendix A). These uncertainties in both deformation and stress then contribute to uncertainty in  $p_d$ . There are no reasons to expect more accurate

values of deformation  $D$  at other times of the year. Because of these uncertainties plus the lack of temporal and spatial resolution in ice strength, we have only computed the average value of  $p_d$ . The triangles and wintertime average values of  $p_d$  are plotted on a map of the Beaufort Sea in Figure 6. The locations of the buoys (triangle vertices) are correct for about the end of January. Total deformation of the array of buoys for the 3 winter months was relatively small.

The most noticeable feature of this figure is the spatial variability in  $p_d$ . Average values of  $p_d$  nearshore along the north coast of Alaska are an order of magnitude larger than values in the rest of the Beaufort Sea. In Figure 4 the spatial variability of the other energy terms  $p_a$ ,  $p_w$ , and  $p_{afd}$  is seen to be only 2 or 3 times larger. This regional variation in  $p_d$  is due to the ability of the ice to transmit stresses and energy horizontally. Energy input by winds and currents over the entire Beaufort Sea is then transmitted by the stress flux divergence and dissipated near the north coast of Alaska.

The spatial distribution of  $p_d$  presented here agrees quite well with the distribution derived from a full AIDJEX model simulation of ice motion and stresses reported in Pritchard et al. (1980). A 17-day period (from late January to early February 1976) was modeled and the results were filtered to obtain average daily values. During the height of two storms during that period, contour maps of  $p_d$  were constructed. Regional differences in  $p_d$  were much greater than we find in the average winter values, but that is merely the difference between one individual storm in one case and averaging many storms and quiet periods in the other. The geographical concentration of  $p_d$  is consistent between the two types of model runs. This fact gives us confidence in the energy dissipation rate field of Figure 6, even though the deformations cannot be determined with confidence.

Furthermore, observations of ridge densities in the Beaufort Sea confirm the distribution of  $p_d$  in Figure 6. Laser profiles (Weeks et al., 1980) off the north coast of Alaska show the heaviest amount of ridging in the area nearshore with ridge density decreasing towards the north. Ridge densities just north of the Mackenzie Delta are less than off the north Alaskan coast (Wadhams, 1975). While the actual magnitudes of the  $p_d$  values in Figure 6 may be incorrect, we are confident of the spatial variations.



**Figure 6. Daily Average Wintertime (Jan-Mar) Values of Rate of Energy Dissipated by Ice ( $p_d$ ) for 33 Locations in Beaufort Sea. -Computed Using Observed Ice Motions and Modeled Stresses.**

6. Comparison of Acoustic Data with Energy Dissipated

In Figure 7 we present a time history of the amplitude of the background signal observed at station 10 (see Figure 2). This result is the daily average obtained by passing a running 24-hour boxcar filter on the data set. The noise is the magnitude of the 1/3 octave spectral band centered at 10 Hz. The reference level is  $I_r = P_r^2 = 1 \mu\text{Pa}^2/\text{Hz}$  and a nondimensional amplitude is presented. The fundamental characteristics of frequency, duration, and relative peak amplitude is similar to the terms in the energy budget history. This time history is included as an example of the data set used to obtain the final results.

Acoustic data are normally presented in terms of noise or sound pressure levels (e.g., Clay and Medwin, 1977; Urlick, 1967)

$$\text{SPL} = 20 \log_{10} \frac{P}{P_r} \text{ dB re } P_r . \quad (15)$$

This is a useful form for studying sound, but we are more interested in the energy content of the sound and so we look instead at the sound intensity level

$$\text{SIL} = 10 \log_{10} \frac{I}{I_r} \text{ dB re } I_r . \quad (16)$$

We also have no strong reason to introduce a logarithmic scale. The linear scale allows us to focus on major storm events in the energy budget. Therefore, the SPL data obtained from Dr. B. M. Buck (personal communication) are converted to normalized linear intensity levels  $\frac{I}{I_r} = 10^{\text{SPL}/10}$ . This quantity is comparable to the unit area energy transfer rates used in the energy budget and provides the appropriate measure that can be related to the source energy level of the acoustic signal.

We should point out that plastic dissipation  $p_\ell$  describes all the energy dissipated when the elastic-plastic model is used. However, during ridge formation a substantial component of  $p_\ell$  represents the increase in gravitational potential energy due to piling ice into sails and keels. This component is not a strong candidate for explaining background noise levels. On the other hand, much of  $p_\ell$  can be attributed

to frictional dissipation due to ice blocks sliding over each other (Rothrock, 1975), and this process is certainly a strong candidate as a noise source. The bumping, breaking, and tumbling of ice blocks during ridge building, while not a large energy sink, must also contribute to noise generation. We have not yet attempted to separate these components of  $p_{\xi}$ . The strongest reason for making a preliminary comparison between  $p_{\xi}$  and noise is that both components satisfy the same functional form, so each is a fixed percentage of  $p_{\xi}$ .

Another shortcoming of the present comparison should be mentioned. We know that sound signals observed at one location are potentially the result of many sources located at different locations, each propagating through the ocean (with its respective transmission loss) until reaching the location of observations. Because of this shortcoming in the current work, we have not attempted to compare individual signals but have attempted to show general trends instead.

For comparison with the energy transfer rates  $p_a$ ,  $p_w$ , and  $p_{afd}$ , seasonal histograms were made for the 10 Hz and 1000 Hz intensities (Figure 8). Note that the distribution of values is similar for both frequencies. The lowest levels of sound intensity are more frequently observed during the summer months, while fall and winter have the predominance of higher intensity signals.

The observed energy transfer rates, on the other hand, had a higher percentage of large values during the summer. The lowest percentage of large values occurred in the spring with fall and winter having intermediate values. Our conjecture is that the energy dissipated by the ice in noise-generating processes is more closely related to observed noise. Computed values of wintertime dissipation are large and we conclude that summertime values of  $p_d$  would be an order of magnitude or more smaller than winter values. Thus, seasonal variations in  $p_d$  are more in agreement with observed acoustic energies than are  $p_a$ ,  $p_w$ , or  $p_{afd}$ .

Spatial variation in the sound intensity more closely resembles the variation in  $p_d$  than the other energy transfer rates. In Figure 9 we present seasonal values of sound intensity averaged using a running 31-day boxcar filter for the 10 Hz signal. The seasonal variation shows




Figure 8a. Daily Average Values of Normalized 10 Hz Sound Intensity. Vertical Scale is Percentage of Observations During the Season at all Locations.





Figure 8b. Daily Average Values of 1000 Hz Sound Intensity. Vertical Scale is Percentage of Observations During the Season at all Locations.



**Figure 9. Time History of 31-Day Moving Average; All Stations, For 10 Hz Normalized Sound Intensity.**

up clearly. In addition, the spatial variability during winter is larger than an order of magnitude, which compares well with spatial variability of  $p_d$ . Other energy transfer rates varied much less spatially.

Although we did not take into account any transmission of sound through the ocean, it is worth noting that the two hydrophone stations nearest shore, where the largest values of  $p_d$  were computed, were two of the three largest wintertime signals in Figure 9.

During summer, strengths that are an order of magnitude or more smaller than in winter reduce the energy dissipated during deformation by a comparable factor (we observe that deformations are of the same magnitude all year). If the hypothesis that noise generation is related to the energy dissipated in ice deformation processes, then the size of this noise signal is also reduced accordingly. We, therefore, have chosen to look first at winter data and attempt to gain confidence in the energy budget when dissipation is largest.

## 7. Conclusions

We have looked at the atmosphere-ice-ocean energy budget in terms of average daily energy transfer at several locations over the Beaufort Sea for approximately one year. Most of the energy exchange occurs during storms lasting from 2 to 5 days. Between most storms there are usually quiet periods of similar duration.

Seasonal differences exist in all the energy exchange terms. Summer months have the largest exchange of energy from the atmosphere  $p_a$  through the ice to the ocean  $p_w$ . This is not due to increased storm activity, as can be seen in  $p_{afd}$ , but rather to decreased ice strength. For the same reason the horizontal transfer of energy  $p_f$  and the dissipation of energy by deformation  $p_d$  will be lowest during the summer free-drift period.

The maximum available energy transfer rate from the atmosphere  $p_{afd}$  is lowest during the spring and then relatively constant during summer, fall, and winter. The observed rates of energy transfer between the atmosphere and the ice  $p_a$  and between the ice and the ocean  $p_w$  are also lowest during the spring.

Spatial variability is also evident in all the observed energy transfer rates ( $p_a$ ,  $p_w$ , and  $p_{afd}$ ). This variation is due to the horizontal dimensions of the storms relative to the observational array. Temporal offsets of storm peaks are seen between widely separated areas of the Beaufort Sea and are due to the motion of storms across the area.

Wintertime computations of the rate of energy dissipation by the ice  $p_d$  shows an even greater variation across the Beaufort Sea. Average wintertime values near the north coast of Alaska are an order of magnitude larger than those in the central or eastern Beaufort. The ability of ice to transmit energy horizontally from one location to another explains this variation.

The rate of energy dissipation cannot be computed directly from observations of motion, winds, and currents as the other energy budget terms can be. The use of an ice model to compute stresses, and all the attendant errors associated with that computation, is necessary. This introduces some uncertainty into the computed magnitude of  $p_d$  which

was computed in this work from observed velocities at vertices of triangles, depicting buoy stations, and a stress history by integrating an elastic-plastic constitutive law. The spatial variability of wintertime averages of  $p_d$  is believed to be valid and is partially confirmed by the observed higher percentage of ridged ice near the north coast of Alaska.

The energy content of observed acoustic signals has been examined. Temporally, the sound energy peaks during the fall, continues high during the winter, drops considerably during the spring, and is lowest during the summer. This pattern corresponds to what we know and expect of the seasonal values of energy dissipation rates in the ice cover. Spatial variability of sound energy over the Beaufort Sea during the winter also corresponds very closely to the variability of  $p_d$ .

The winds are one important source of energy for noise production. Previous attempts to correlate observed noise with observed winds have been only partially successful. The rate at which energy is transferred from the winds to the ice appears to correlate perhaps a little better than the winds. The introduction of horizontal energy transfer and energy dissipation in the ice offers a reasonable explanation of the seasonal and spatial distribution of under-ice noise.

Other energy transfers (i.e., thermal energy from the ocean and ice to the atmosphere) have not been considered in this study. Neither did we attempt to separate sound energy according to generating mechanisms (i.e., thermal cracking of the ice, wind-blown snow, ocean turbulence, or ice deformation). The results of this study are consistent with the observation that ice deformational events (ridging, rafting, and shearing) contribute a major portion of the energy generating background noise in the Arctic.

References

- Albright, M. (1980) "Geostrophic Wind Calculations for AIDJEX," Sea Ice Processes and Models, R. S. Pritchard, ed., Seattle: University of Washington Press, pp. 402-409.
- Brown, R. A. (1976) "The Resistance Law," AIDJEX Bulletin No. 31, March.
- Burke, S. P., and Buck, B. M., (1975) "The Synrams Ice Station," IEEE Ocean '75, pp. 413-417.
- Clay, S. C., and Medwin, H. (1977) Acoustical Oceanography: Principles and Applications, New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Coon, M. D. (1980) "A Review of AIDJEX Modeling," Sea Ice Processes and Models, R. S. Pritchard, ed., Seattle: University of Washington Press, pp. 12-27.
- Coon, M. D., and Pritchard, R. S. (1979) "Mechanical Energy Considerations in Sea-Ice Dynamics," Journal of Glaciology, Vol. 24, No. 90.
- Coon, M. D., Maykut, G. A., Pritchard, R. S., Rothrock, D. A., and Thorndike, A. S. (1974) "Modeling the Pack-Ice as an Elastic-Plastic Material," AIDJEX Bulletin No. 24, May.
- Greene, C. R., and Buck, B. M. (1977) "Arctic Noise Measurement Experiment Using Nimbus 6 Data Buoys," U.S. Navy Journal of Underwater Acoustics, Vol. 27, No. 4.
- Greene, C. R., and Buck, B. M. (1978) "Influence of Atmospheric-Pressure Gradient on Under-Ice Ambient Noise," U.S. Navy Journal of Underwater Acoustics, Vol. 28, No. 4.
- Hibler, W. D. III (1980) "Numerical Modeling of Sea Ice in the Seasonal Sea Ice Zone," Cold Regions Science and Technology, Amsterdam: Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company, pp. 299-321.
- Leavitt, E., Albright, M., and Bauman, R. (1978) "Variations in Planetary Boundary Layer Parameters Observed during AIDJEX," AIDJEX Bulletin No. 39, May.
- Malvern, L. E. (1969) Introduction to the Mechanics of a Continuous Medium, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- McPhee, M. G. (1980) "An Analysis of Pack Ice Drift in Summer," Sea Ice Processes and Models, R. S. Pritchard, ed., Seattle: University of Washington Press, pp. 62-75.

- Newton, J. L. (1973) "The Canada Basin: Mean Circulation and Intermediate-Scale Flow Features," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington.
- Pritchard, R. S. (1975) "An Elastic-Plastic Constitutive Law for Sea Ice," Journal of Applied Mechanics, Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 379-384.
- Pritchard, R. S. (1977) "The Effect of Strength on Simulations of Sea Ice Dynamics," POAC 77, D. B. Muggeridge, ed., St. John's: Memorial University of Newfoundland, pp. 494-505.
- Pritchard, R. S. (1980) "A Simulation of Nearshore Winter Ice Dynamics in the Beaufort Sea," Sea Ice Processes and Models, R. S. Pritchard, ed., Seattle: University of Washington Press, pp. 49-61.
- Pritchard, R. S., Coon, M. D., and Thomas, D. R. (1979) Modeling the Mechanical Energy Budget of the Beaufort Sea Ice Cover, Flow Research Report No. 137R, Kent, Washington: Flow Research Company.
- Rothrock, D. A. (1975) "The Energetics of the Plastic Deformation of Pack Ice by Ridging," Journal of Geophysical Research, Vol. 80, No. 33, November 20.
- Rothrock, D. A., Colony, R., and Thorndike, A. S. (1980) "Testing Pack Ice Constitutive Laws with Stress Divergence Measurements," Sea Ice Processes and Models, R. S. Pritchard, ed., Seattle: University of Washington Press, pp. 102-113.
- Thorndike, A. S., and Cheung, J. Y. (1977) "AIDJEX Measurements of Sea Ice Motion 11 April 1975 to 14 May 1976," AIDJEX Bulletin No. 35, January.
- Thorndike, A. S., and Colony, R. (1977) "Estimating the Deformation of Sea Ice," POAC 77, D. B. Muggeridge, ed., St. John's: University of Newfoundland, pp. 506-517.
- Thorndike, A. S., and Colony, R. (1980) "Large-Scale Ice Motion in the Beaufort Sea," Sea Ice Processes and Models, R. S. Pritchard, ed., Seattle: University of Washington Press, pp. 249-260.
- Thorndike, A. S., Rothrock, D. A., Maykut, G. A., and Colony, R. (1975) "The Thickness Distribution of Sea Ice," Journal of Geophysical Research, Vol. 80, No. 33, pp. 4501-4513.
- Truesdell, C. A., and Toupin, R. A. (1960) "The Classical Field Theories," Encyclopedia of Physics, Vol. III/1, S. Flügge, ed., Berlin: Springer-Verlag, pp. 226-793.
- Urick, R. J. (1967) Principals of Underwater Sound for Engineers, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Wadhams, P. (1975) Sea Ice Morphology in the Beaufort Sea, Tech. Report No. 36, The Beaufort Sea Project.

Wadhams, P., and Horne, R. (1978) An Analysis of Ice Profiles Obtained by Submarine Sonar in the AIDJEX Area of the Beaufort Sea, Scott Polar Research Institute Technical Report 78-1.

Weeks, W. F., Tucker, W. B., Frank, M., and Funcharoen, S. (1980)  
"Characterization of Surface Roughness and Floe Geometry of Sea Ice over the Continental Shelves of the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas,"  
Sea Ice Processes and Models, R. S. Pritchard, ed., Seattle:  
University of Washington Press, pp. 300-312.

Appendix A. Elastic-Plastic Material Model

We introduce the AIDJEX model (Coon et al., 1974; Coon, 1980) which describes the ice behavior by an elastic-plastic material response. This is an approximation to rigid plastic behavior with the stiff elastic component included more for numerical than for physical reasons.


The stress state  $\underline{\sigma}$  is required by the yield criterion

$$\phi(\underline{\sigma}, p^*) \leq 0 \quad (\text{A.1})$$

to lie within the yield surface ( $\phi = 0$ ). A diamond yield surface (Figure A.1) provides accurate simulation of sea ice dynamics (Pritchard, 1977; Pritchard et al., 1979) when coupled with a normal flow rule

$$\underline{D}_{-p} = \lambda \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \underline{\sigma}}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where  $\underline{D}_{-p}$  is plastic stretching and  $\lambda$  is a nonnegative scalar.



**Figure A.1. Sea Ice Yield Surface.** The Axes are Stress Invariants:  $\sigma_I = 1/2 \text{tr } \underline{\sigma}$  and  $\sigma_{II} = (1/2 \text{tr } \underline{\sigma}' \underline{\sigma}')^{1/2}$  where  $\underline{\sigma}' = \underline{\sigma} - \sigma_I \mathbf{1}$  is the Deviatoric Stress. The Diamond-Shaped Surface is Visualized by Rotating the Curve Around the Abscissa, which Represents Independence of the Direction of the Principal Stress.

The elastic response within and on the yield curve is

$$\underline{\underline{\sigma}} = (M_1 - M_2) \underline{\underline{1}} \text{tr } \underline{\underline{e}} + 2M_2 \underline{\underline{e}} \quad , \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where  $\underline{\underline{e}}$ , the elastic strain, satisfies the kinematic relationship (Pritchard, 1975)

$$\dot{\underline{\underline{e}}} - \underline{\underline{W}}\underline{\underline{e}} + \underline{\underline{e}}\underline{\underline{W}} = \underline{\underline{D}} - \underline{\underline{D}}_p \quad (\text{A.4})$$

for stretching  $\underline{\underline{D}} = \frac{1}{2}(\underline{\underline{L}} + \underline{\underline{L}}^t)$ , for spin  $\underline{\underline{W}} = \frac{1}{2}(\underline{\underline{L}} - \underline{\underline{L}}^t)$ , and  $\underline{\underline{L}} = \nabla \underline{\underline{v}}$  is the velocity gradient.

The rate of change of energy due to deformation  $p_d$  (called stress power by Truesdell and Toupin, 1960) may be decomposed for this material model by substituting Equation (A.4) into Equation (11) so that

$$p_d = \text{tr } \underline{\underline{\sigma}} \dot{\underline{\underline{e}}} + \text{tr } \underline{\underline{\sigma}} \underline{\underline{D}}_p \quad . \quad (\text{A.5})$$

There is no contribution to  $p_d$  from spin in this formulation. The recoverable and dissipative rates of energy change are thus separated as

$$p_d = \dot{U}_e + p_\ell \quad . \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where  $\dot{U}_e$  is the rate of change of elastic strain energy

$$\dot{U}_e = \text{tr } \underline{\underline{\sigma}} \dot{\underline{\underline{e}}} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

and  $p_\ell$  is the rate of plastic dissipation by the stress during deformation

$$p_\ell = \text{tr } \underline{\underline{\sigma}} \underline{\underline{D}}_p \quad . \quad (\text{A.8})$$

The elastic strain energy function  $U_e$  is a quadratic function of elastic strain (Malvern, 1969) that may be converted to stress components using Equation (A.3) giving

$$U_e = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\sigma_I^2}{M_1} + \frac{\sigma_{II}^2}{M_2} \right) \quad (\text{A.9})$$

-37-

The material constants in this work are chosen as

$$\begin{aligned} p^* &= 10^5 \text{ N/m} \\ M_1 &= 10^7 \text{ N/m} \\ M_2 &= 0.5 \times 10^7 \text{ N/m} \end{aligned}$$

For these values it is possible to determine an upper bound for the contribution of the rate of change of elastic strain energy to the energy budget. This contribution must be small if it is to be assumed that the elastic response is stiff enough to approximate rigid-plastic behavior. The elastic strain energy is bounded by

$$0 \leq U_e \leq 1/2 \frac{(-p^*)^2}{M_1} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

for these material constants and the diamond yield surface. If the stress state is assumed to cross the yield surface completely in a single one-day time step ( $\Delta = 1$  day), then the maximum elastic strain rate is achieved. The maximum elastic strain is limited to the order of 1 percent per day by  $p^*/(M_1\Delta) = 0.01 \text{ day}^{-1}$ . Therefore, the maximum rate of change of elastic strain energy is

$$|\dot{U}_e|_{\max} = 5 \text{ mW/m}^2 \quad (\text{A.11})$$

DATE  
FILMED  
- 8