Progress Report

Frequency and Angular Dependence of Low Frequency East China Sea Bottom Scattering Strengths

Y. Dorfman, P.G. Cable (BBN Technologies)
D.P. Knobles, T.W. Yudichak (ARL:UT)

ASIAEX Collaborators:
R. Zhang, Z. Peng, F. Li, Z. Li (IOA, Chinese Academy of Sciences)
Ji-Xun Zhou (GT)
P.H. Dahl (APL-UW)
J.H. Miller, G.R. Potty (URI)

Report Documentation Page

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED
01 DEC 2001	**N/A**	**-**

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE **Frequency and Angular Dependence of Low Frequency East China Sea Bottom Scattering Strengths**	5a. CONTRACT NUMBER 5b. GRANT NUMBER 5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER
6. AUTHOR(S)	5d. PROJECT NUMBER 5e. TASK NUMBER 5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) **BBN Technologies, ARL:UT and Collaborators: and IOA, Chinese Academy of Sciences, GT, APL-UW, URI**	8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)	10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) 11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT
Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES
Also See: M001452, The original document contains color images.

14. ABSTRACT

15. SUBJECT TERMS

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT **unclassified**	b. ABSTRACT **unclassified**	c. THIS PAGE **unclassified**	**UU**	**23**	

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98)
Prescribed by ANSI Std Z39-18

Scattering Strength Extraction

- SS = RL(t) + TL(t) – ESL – 10log10(πCR(t))
  - SS is empirical scattering strength.
  - RL is time-dependent received level.
  - TL is time-dependent two-way transmission loss.
  - ESL is energy source level.
  - πCR(t) ~ A(t) - insonified area, R(t) is range, and omnidirectional source is assumed.
- Above, terms explicitly dependent on time are highlighted with red color.
- For range-independent environments, $SS=SS(\Theta_{inc},\Theta_{scat})$, and not SS(t).
- Initial approach:
  - Use TL as modeled by ARL/UT based on
    - Inversion of environmental properties based on measured 38 g shots propagation.
    - Forward propagation modeling
  - Use use Wakeley model for ESL of the explosive 1 kg source.
  - Use RL as recorded by VLA:
    - Individual sensor for angle-aggregate SS.
    - Beamform to extract angular dependence.
- Turns out, we have problems with source model.
- Adjust approach:
  - Do the best possible under circumstances estimate of the SS.
  - Characterize uncertainty in SS resulting from uncertainty in source and TL.

Source Function Sensitivity to Weight Uncertainty

VLA data, 38 g Shot1



- Source PSD depends on WBS depth/mass.
- Depth can be inferred from direct arrival structure.
- If available, pulse separation gives estimate of weight.
- If can not resolve, assume some spread of weight, estimate uncertainty in energy density spectrum level (EDSL).
- Bottom right: EDSL uncertainty for 30% weight spread.

Estimate depth → Wakeley model – estimate weight

Wakeley model – quantify uncertainty



For 30% weight uncertainty, source level uncertainty is less than 2.5 dB.

Uncertainty, known depth



1 kg Shot, Direct Arrival on VLA and Desensitized Phone

- For reference, model results are shown for 1 kg (red) and 1.8 kg (green) source at 30 m depth.
- Top: desensitized phone data.
- Bottom: direct arrival structure.
  - About 30 m detonation depth.
  - Individual arrivals are hard to identify.
- Features in overloaded direct arrival vaguely hint at 1.8 kg/30 m source. But 1.8 kg actual weight is unlikely for 1 kg nominal charge.



Can infer depth but not weight.

Use nominal weight, quantify error.





Range Dependence in Source Function

1 kg Charge





Wakeley model to compute source function for 38 g and 1 kg source at 50 m depth at range of 100 m, 1 km, and 10 km.

Top: EDSL, 2 Hz and 20 Hz resolution.

Bottom: EDSL deviation from that at 100 m.

Left: 1 kg charge.

Right: 38 g charge.

38 g Charge





With 1 kg charge, observe f-dependence with range.

True feature of nonlinear source or Wakeley model artifact? Implications on SS?

Single Sensor SS, Mid-Water Sensor – 45 m

At 3 km



At 5 km



- Linear TL model:
  - F^3 dependence.
  - SS increasing with range for 420 Hz.
- Non-linear TL:
  - F^2 dependence.
  - SS decreases with R for 420.
- L/NL
  - In between: $F^{2.5}$.
  - R-independent.
- Different TL models:
  - dB-difference not huge, but predict different F-dependence.
  - Which F-dependence is right?

Single Sensor SS: Range Dependence, Mid-Water – 44 m



Linear TL:

- SS in dependent of range for 120, 240 Hz.
- SS increasing with range for 420, 840 Hz.
- Increases more for 840 Hz.

L/NL TL:

- SS independent of range.

Is it an accidental fit, or do we really need to consider NL effects?

Question

- Assuming non-linear source, can “straighten” range-dependence of SS.
- Does this mean that we should account for source nonlinearity?
- May be, but may be not, as there are potential mechanisms for range dependence of the SS:
  - Range-dependence of environment
  - Scattering into different angles (coupling between modes) increasingly important with range

Single Sensor SS, Shallow Sensor – 15 m

At 3 km



Results very similar to mid-water sensor

At 5 km



Single Sensor SS, Deep Sensor – 70 m

At 3 km



Results very similar to mid-water and shallow sensors.

At 5 km



Uncertainty in SS Estimate?

- Shot-to-shot stability:
- Look at all 4 shots provided.
  - Shallow sensor.
  - Common TL model
    - Linear TL
    - Range-independent src.
- Very similar results for 4 shots



- Observe same SS for shots 1-4.
- Potentially 2.5 dB uncertainty due to weight.
- Uncertainty in level and F-dependence.
  - Linear TL model results in
    - Higher SS above 200 Hz
    - F^3 frequency dependence of SS
    - SS increasing with R for R=4-10 km, F>240 Hz.
  - Nonlinear TL model results in
    - Lower SS above 200 Hz
    - $F^{2.5}$ frequency dependence of SS
    - SS independent of range for R=4-10 km.
- What is the correct TL model?
- Do we need to address non-linear source effects?
- Conclude:
  - dB-difference between L and NL models not huge - within 5dB.
  - But TL model affects F-dependence (important for understanding physics/mechanisms of bottom interaction)
  - It is important to settle on the correct TL model and determine correct F-dependence of the SS.

Array Processing

- VLA can be used to study dependence of bottom SS on the scattering angle.
- I focus on bottom subarray (middle column). Reasons:
  - Down refracting so to look at low grazing angles need to be close to bottom.
  - Remove contribution from surface, focus on bottom scattering contribution.
  - SNR is good to 5-10 km depending on steering angle and frequency band.



250 Hz octave
Normalized
by horizontal.

Signal clipped
if SNR≤3 dB

Angular Dependence of Scattering Strength: Procedure

- To determine bottom scattering strength SS(F,R, α_i, α_s), need to normalize beam output by
  - Source function
  - Insonified area
  - TL
- Incidence angle α_i:
  - Can not be controlled with explosive source.
  - Can only be determined from modeling.
  - May change as function of range due to stripping of high angles.
- Scattering angle α_s:
  - Can be related to steering angle.
- Using different array beams, can obtain SS(F,R ,α_{i0},α_s)
  - α_{i0} is average incidence angle (fixed at each range).
- Caveat 1: As for single sensor, SS potentially depend on range due to scattering into different angles (coupling between modes).
- Caveat 2: SS may depend on range through TL dependent on angle (bounce loss). Need to use TL(f,R,θ_S), where θ_S is steering angle. Used single-phone TL(f,R) instead.

SS in Beam: Range Dependence

240 Hz



- As for sensor, have similar source-induced uncertainty.
  - Linear source: dash curves, upward rend
  - Nonlinear source: dotted curves, downward trend
  - Linear/Nonlinear combination: solid curves.

420 Hz



840 Hz



SS vs. Angle at Scatterer and Frequency

- $SS(\theta_G, f)$
  - f is frequency
  - θ_G is average array beam incidence angle at the bottom (average scattering angle).
- Notation:
  - Negative angles: results observed in down-steered beams.
  - Positive angles: results observed in up-steered beams.



SS in Beam: Angular and Frequency Dependence

Base: Linear TL, Range-Independent Source





Try Range-Dependent Source





Angular dependence: surprisingly Lambertian

Very steep F-dependence:

- In low beams, steeper than F^4

Error in SS extract?

Or tells us about scattering mechanisms?

SS in Beam: Angular and Frequency Dependence

Base: Linear TL, Range-Independent Source





Lambertian angular dependence.

Steep F-dependence:

- F^4 in low beams – sub-bottom?
- Any errors in SS extract?
- F^4 or steeper?

Base: Linear/Nonlinear TL, Range-Dependent Source





Questions/Issues

- Assuming non-linear source, can “straighten” range-dependence of SS in single sensor and in beam.
- Does this mean that we should account for source nonlinearity?
- May be, but may be not, as there are potential mechanisms for range dependence of the SS:
  - Range-dependence of environment
  - Scattering into different angles (coupling between modes) increasingly important with range
  - Angular dependence of TL for the VLA beam data.

Conclusions

- Generally low bottom SS, increasing with frequency for f>400 Hz.
- Steep frequency dependence, steepening with decreasing of grazing scattering angle.
- At each frequency, angular dependence can be approximated by Lambert Law. Assuming 15^0 incidence angle (which is close to maximum propagating angle), need McKenzie coefficient of about –50 dB (at 120 Hz) to about –40 dB (at 840 Hz).
  - Low values of McKenzie coefficient.
  - Lambert Law provides functional fit but does not correctly describe the physics of scattering. Impossible to relate required values of McKenzie coefficient to environmental parameters.

- Need to compare to physics-based theoretical predictions (e.g.: surface, sediment, volumetric, SP/Born).
  - F-dependence of SS is very important as it may suggest bottom interaction mechanisms
    - For example, F^4 can be argued due to scattering from small scatterers distributed near water/bottom interface (biologic activity?)
  - Current uncertainty in TL modeling does not result in large dB-difference in SS extractions, but affects frequency dependence.
  - Need to better understand empirical SS for better understanding of scattering mechanisms.

BACKUP

Importance of Nonlinear Effects

- Pierce , "Acoustics": Nonlinearity counts if $\beta \cdot P_0 \cdot 2\pi F_0/(\rho \cdot C^3) > \alpha$, where:
  - β=3.5 is parameter of nonlinearity.
  - P_0 and F_0 are pressure and frequency characteristic for the waveform.
  - α is linear attenuation (in nepers/m): $\alpha = 10^{-3}/10\log10(e)$, where a is attenuation in dB/km.
- Use empirical expressions from Urick for a charge of W lbs at range R feet:
  - $P_0 = C_0 \cdot 2.16 \cdot 10^4 \cdot (W^{1/3}/r)^{1.13}$ (Pa), where $C_0 = (0.454 \cdot 9.8)/0.0254^2$;
  - $F_0 = 10^6/\tau$ - characteristic frequency, Hz, where $\tau = 58 \cdot W^{1/3} \cdot (W^{1/3}/r)^{0.22}$ – characteristic duration, μs
- Use empirical curves for free water attenuation from Dyer:
  - $a = (3:30) \cdot 10^{-3} \cdot (F_0/1000)^2$ – attenuation, dB/km, for $T = 4^0$-22^0 C (lower for higher temperature).
  - $\alpha = a \cdot 10^{-3}/10\log10(e)$.
- In reality, transition to linear happens earlier due to:
  - a and α are higher due to additional attenuation on boundary interaction.
  - P_0 and F_0 were computed with account to spherical spreading, but spreading may further slow steepening





38 g Shot, Direct Arrival on VLA

- Small source ground truth: 38 g detonated at 50 m.
- From data: detonation depth is about 52 m – from first arrival structure on VLA.
- On direct arrival all hydrophones (including desensitized) clipped but multipath and bubble pulse structure is clearly evident.
- Separation between pulses can be used to infer detonation strength.





38 g Shot, Direct Arrival on Desensitized Phone vs. Wakeley

- Below, data are compared to the Wakeley model.
- Levels between data and model can't be matched because of clipping.
- To fit the scale, source was placed at 100 m.
  - Black dot: P_{max}≈217 dB//µPa – peak level at 100 m per Urick. Shown for reference.
  - Black: data, desensitized hydrophone (clipped).
  - Red: 38 g source at 50 m depth, does not match pulse separation in data.
  - Green: 25 g source at 50 m, matches pulse separation.
  - Blue: 38 g source at 60 m, also matches pulse separation, but depth does not match that inverted from first arrival.



Conclude:

Actual detonation depth is about nominal.

Actual charge is 25 g – 34% less than nominal.