

1.4 Some Deductions from the Light Field Models

The three models for natural and artificial light fields derived above allow us to explain and interrelate *many of the observed features of light fields in natural hydrosols. We shall consider here and in subsequent sections a small representative sample of such activity, based on simple deductions from the three models.*

The Decay of the General Light Field with Depth

We shall now show how (7) of Sec. 1.2 follows from the two-flow model for light fields. Toward this end, we let the scattering medium X be infinitely deep and be absorbing, i.e., $a > 0$. Then we compute the net downward irradiance at a general depth, using (6), (7) of Sec. 1.3.

$$H(z,-) = H(z,-) - H(z,+)$$

$$= (g - g_+) e^{-m_+ z} - m_+ e^{-kz}$$

Now from (16) of Sec. 1.3 we find, by *integrating* between depths 0 and z, and noting that $h(z)$ is a non negative quantity for all z:

$$H(z,-) - H(0,-) = \int_0^z dH(z,-) - a \int_0^z h(z) dz < 0$$

Hence for all z:

$$H(z,-) < H(0,-) \quad (2)$$

SEC. 1.4 SOME DEDUCTIONS 67

This shows that the net downward irradiance is bounded. Indeed, from Tables 2, 3 of Sec. 1.2 we can estimate an upper bound of $H(z,-)$ as 1396 **watts/mx, and infer that $ff(z,-) \geq 0$ in real optical media.** It follows that (2) and (1), along with $a \geq 0$, force m_+ to be zero; otherwise we could find a depth z at which (2) would be violated.

Some further general inequalities related to (2) are given in Sec. 9.2.:

Having established that $m_+ = 0$ in infinitely deep absorbing media, (6), (7), of Sec. 1.3 yield the requisite forms of $H(z,t)$ for every z:

$H(z)$

From (3), (4) we have, on setting $z=0$:

$$H(0,-) = m_+ g_+$$

$$H(0,+)$$

Let us write

"R_w"

$$\text{for } R_w = H(0,+)/H(0,-)$$

Clearly, we then have from (3), (4.)

$$\frac{H(0,+)}{H(0,-)} = \frac{H(z,+)}{H(z,-)}$$

$$R_w = \frac{H(z,+)}{H(z,-)}$$

$$k - aD \quad 1 + aD \quad k + aD \quad k$$

This shows that the reflectance R of the medium is independent of depth and determinable once a , k , and D are known. Hence for every z ,

$$H(z, +) = H(z, -)R,$$

where

$$R = \frac{H(0, +) - H(0, -)}{H(0, +) + H(0, -)} = \frac{g_+ - g_-}{g_+ + g_-}$$

$$H(D, +)e^{-kz}$$

(6)

for all z .

Furthermore, by definition of the distribution factor D (cf. (1) of Sec. 1.3) we have, with the help of (8) of Sec.

2 INTRODUCTION VOL. I

$$h(z) = a h(z, +) + h(z, -)$$

$$D(H(z, +) + H(z, -))$$

$$D(H(0, +) + H(0, -)) e^{-kz}$$

$$e^{-kz}$$

$$h(0) \quad (7)$$

which is the theoretical basis for (7) of Sec. 1.20

Observe how the assumption that $a > 4$, is needed in various parts of the arguments above. This assumption is quite reasonable in terrestrial settings; indeed, in such settings the condition $a = 0$ for every wavelength is never observed. What would the light field look like in an infinitely deep medium in which $a = p$? Equation (1) shows us, that if $a \rightarrow 0$ for all wavelengths, then; since $g_- = g_+ = 1$,

$$j71(Z, -)$$

so that

$$H(z, -) = H(z, +)$$

at all depths z and for all wavelengths. The sea would be of the same general brightness and color of the sky in this case - -at every depth

Reflectance and Transmittance of Finitely Deep Hydrosols

The simple two-flow model allows us to estimate the reflectances and transmittances of finitely deep layers of water. We return to (6), (7) of Sec. 1.3 and consider a finitely deep homogeneous layer whose upper surface is at 0 and whose lower surface is at z .

The upper surface is irradiated with a given irradiance $H(0, -)$ and we set $H(z, +) = 0$, which simulates zero irradiation at the lower boundary (Fig. 1.40 (a)). We then find the m_+ , m_- corresponding to these two given irradiances, and solve for $H(0, +)$. Thus, if

under these conditions we write

$$R = \frac{H(0, +)}{H(0, -)}$$

$$\text{for } R = \frac{H(0, +)}{H(0, -)}$$

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow 0} \frac{R_Y(T)}{T} = \mathbf{T-1040}$$

(14)

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow 0} \frac{1 - T}{T} = \mathbf{ZY}$$

$$(15) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow 0} \frac{1 - R_Y(T)}{T} = \frac{1 + Y^2}{aD + b}$$

(16) From (15) we see that the reflectance of very thin slabs is proportional to the backscattering coefficient b . Indeed, so that;
 $\lim_{T \rightarrow 0} Z = 0$

$R_Y(T) \approx bz$ (17)
 for small T . From (16) we see that the transmittance of very thin slabs is:

$$- (aD + b)z \quad (18)$$

From (17), (18) we conclude that for thin slabs:

$R(T) \approx T$
 and if in general we write:
 $T_Y(T)$

$$- (aD)z$$

$$C R_Y(T) + T_Y(T) = J \quad (19)$$

for
 we see that in particular for thin slabs:
 $A_Y(T) \approx T$

$$A_Y(T)$$

Clearly $A_Y(T)$ for general T is the amount of irradiance absorbed by a slab of optical thickness T and with optical properties a , b , and D . From (19) we have the general conservation law:

SEC* 1* 4 SOME DEDUCTIONS 71

$$A_Y(T) + R_Y(T) + T_Y(T) = 1 \quad (21)$$

Figs. 1.41, 1.42 represent $R_Y(T)$ and Fig. 1.43 represents $T_Y(T)$ for a selected set of y and T values. Values of k and y can be obtained by direct computation from the definitions of k and y , or *by their graphs in Figs. 1.44, 1.45*. The computations were done by Mrs. Judith Marshall.

Invariant Imbedding Relations for Irradiance

We now wish to investigate a particularly interesting property of the reflectance and transmittance functions $R_y(T)$ and $T_y(T)$ defined above. This property will allow us to

write down Eqs. (6),-(7) of Sec. 1.3 by sight for homogeneous media with transparent boundaries. We shall fix attention on an arbitrary medium X whose upper boundary is at optical depth 0 and whose lower boundary is at optical depth $c (= zk)$, where z is the geometric depth of the medium. Since X is fixed throughout the present paragraph, we can drop the "y" from the R and T notation. Furthermore, to emphasize the geometric limits of X we shall denote it by " $X(0,c)$ ".

Now suppose $X(0,c)$ is irradiated at the upper boundary only. Then by definition of $R(c)$ and $T(c)$ we have:

$$H(0_0+) = H(0_0-) + R(c) \quad (22)$$

$$H(c, -) = H(0, -) - T(c) \quad (23)$$

This is a simple application of (8) and (10) and the basic meanings of $R(c)$ and $T(c)$. Next, assume that $X(0,c)$ is irradiated only on its lower boundary. Then, by the same token:

$$H(0, +) = H(c, +) + T(c) \quad (24)$$

$$H(c, -) = H(c, +) - R(c) \quad (25)$$

These formulas follow rigorously using the pattern of derivation leading to (8) and (10). However, they should be intuitively clear simply on the basis that $T(c)$ and $R(c)$ are transmittances and reflectances of homogeneous slabs of scattering absorbing material of optical thickness $-c$ in which complete symmetry of the light field has been assumed (in the form of (1) of Sec. 1.3).

Furthermore, and this is a crucial step, because the basic differential equations of the two-flow model are linear, we have at our beck and call the mathematical principle of linear superposition of solutions of these equations. Thus, if $X(0;c)$ is irradiated simultaneously at levels 0 and c ,

72

INTRODUCTION VOL. I

FIG. 1.41 .01SY:1 .80. FIG. 1.42 .80 < y S:98.

.0

Calculated reflectance $R_Y(T)$ versus T , for Calculated reflectance $I_t(T)$ versus T , for

SEC. 1,4 SOME DEDUCTIONS 73

FIG. 1.43 Calculated transmittance $T(T)$ versus T , for .01 < Y s'0989

Y

then we would be correct in Writing, the observed emergent irradiances at levels 4 and c as..

$$H(O_+) = H(O_-)R(c) + H(c_+)T(c)$$

$$H(O,-w)T(c) + H(c,+R(c) .$$

(26)

(27)

These equations are readily forthcoming from (6), (7) of Sec. 1.3; however, we shall imagine for the moment that they form a relatively new basis for approaching radiative transfer problems, and that they are just as basic (as indeed they are) as the two flow equations (4), (5) of Sec. 1,3 in setting up the foundations of the two-flow model. We shall spend much time on this point of view and its generalizations in Chapters 3, 7, and 8. For the moment we adopt it in the form of (26) and (27) and apply it in a simple and direct manner so as to explain the essential ideas behind it. In order to illustrate in a relatively concrete manner the properties of (26) and (27), we shall consider an actual natural hydrosol in the framework of the one-D model.

Thus let us suppose that

$D = 2$ (diffuse light distribution factor)

(volume absorption coefficient)

74 INTRODUCTION V4 L. I

2.0

0 1.0

.2

.8

1. 1.2

FIG. 1.44 Calculated k versus aU , for $4 < b < 10$. FIG. 1.45 Calculated Y versus aD , for $.01 < b < 1.4$

SEC. 1.4 SOME DEDUCTIONS 75

Hence:

$aD = .234/m$ (volume absorption coefficient for diffuse light)

Further we suppose:

$s = .325/m$ (volume total scattering coefficient)

and

$0.010/m$ (volume backward scattering coefficient for diffuse light)

From the graphs for Y , and k , we find that for this medium

$.9b$

$k = .250/m$ (diffuse attenuation coefficient)

For later reference we note that:

$a = a + s = .442/m$ (volume attenuation coefficient)

For a medium of depth:

$z = 4$ meters, we have an optical depth of:

$c = zk = 1$.

According to the graphs for R and T, for such a medium:
and so:

$$R(i) = 0.18 \quad T(1) = 0.360$$

$$A(1) = 0.622.$$

All these optical properties are to be considered for illustrative purposes only. In the present example, they pertain not to a single wavelength but to average values over the visible spectrum. Suppose that the medium $X(4,1)$ has transparent upper and lower boundaries and that it is irradiated such that:

$$H(D,-) = 504 \text{ watt/m}^2$$

$$H(1,+) = 100 \text{ watt/m}^2$$

The $H(0,-)$ chosen here simulates a typical visible spectrum irradiance produced by a noonday sun at sea level on a horizontal plane, under a sky with clear dry air (cf. Table 2 of Sec. 1,2). Then the upward irradiance at the upper boundary is, according to (2b):

$$+ 100 \times 0.360$$

$$45 \text{ watts/m}^2.$$

is downward irradiance at the lower boundary is:

$$H(D,+) = 500.$$

76 INTRODUCTION VOL .I

$$H(10,-)$$

$$500$$

$$0.360 + 100 \times 0.18$$

$$182 \text{ watts/m}^2$$

Finally, the number of incident watts absorbed per square meter of boundary within $X(0,1)$ are:

$$(H(0,-) + H(1,+))$$

$$0.622 = 373 \text{ watts /M}^2$$

Suppose now that $X(0,1)$ has a reflecting lower boundary. We wish to show next that the upward irradiance $H(1,+)$ just above the lower boundary of $X(0,1)$ can be computed directly,

if the reflectance r of the lower boundary is known. Suppose that

$$r = 0.050$$

and suppose that only $H(0,-)$ is given. Let the associated light field be set up in $X(0,1)$, Then if we know the irradiance $H(1,-)$ on the lower boundary, we have.

$$H(1,-) = H(1,+)(1-r) \quad (28)$$

$H(1,+)$ is the incident irradiance on the body of $X(4,1)$ just within its lower boundary. Then, by (27),

$$H(1,-) = T(1)H(1,+) + R(1)H(1,-) \quad (29)$$

Combining (28), (29) we have, on solving for $H(1,-)$:

$$H(1,-) = \frac{H(0,-) - T(1)H(1,+)}{1 - R(1) - T(1)r} \quad (30)$$

Suppose that $H(0,-) = 500 \text{ watts/m}^2$, then (30) yields :

$$H(1,-) = \frac{500 - 0.360 \times 100}{1 - 0.05 - 0.02}$$

$$= .180 \text{ watts/m}^2$$

In other words, on comparing this $H(1,-)$ with that worked out above, a bottom boundary reflecting by an amount $r = .050$ will contribute essentially nothing measurable to $H(1,-)$. By (28) we have

$$H(1,+) = 180$$

~~X~~

$$.050 = .9 \text{ watts/m}^2$$

What should the reflectance r of the lower boundary be in order to yield the $H(1,+) = 100 \text{ watts/m}^2$ we used in the first illustration above? Multiplying each side of (30) by r , and using (28) we have

SEC. 1.4 SOME DEDUCTIONS 77

$$H(1,+) = H(0,-)T + rH(1,-)R$$

Solving for r :

$$\begin{aligned} H(1,+)R &= H(0,-)T \\ 100 \times .018 &+ 500 \times .360 \\ = 100 &= .550 \\ 182 \end{aligned}$$

which could for example simulate a light sandy bottom. Observe that the denominator in the preceding expression for r is simply $H(1,-)$ under the present boundary conditions. These examples begin to show the use of the one-D model in making elementary calculations concerning everyday matters in the study of hydrologic optics, including the effects of nontransparent boundaries.

We continue with another illustration which shows how to find the internal irradiances in $X(0,1)$ knowing the incident irradiances on its transparent upper and lower boundaries..

Suppose we *have the* incident irradiances:

$$H(0,-) = 500 \text{ watts/m}^2$$

$$H(1,+) = 100 \text{ watts/m}^2$$

We want to find $H(1/2, \pm)$, i.e., the irradiances at the midlevel of the present medium.

Now since (26), (27) hold for arbitrary media of optical depths c , let us apply them to the two subslabs $X(0,1/2)$, and $X(1/2,1)$ which comprise the upper and lower halves of $X(0,1)$, respectively (see Fig. 1.46).

Applying (26) to $X(0,1/2)$

$$H(0,-)R(1/2) + H(1/2,+)T(1/2) \quad (31)$$

$$H(1/2,-) = H(0,-)T(1/2) + H(1/2,+)R(1/2) \quad (32)$$

Of the irradiances we know only $H(0,-)$, and we want to find $H(1/2, \pm)$. We also do not know $H(0,+)$. We therefore need more relations. Returning to (26), (27), and applying them to $X(1/2,1)$, we have:

$$H(1/2,+) = H(1/2,-)R(1/2) + H(1,+)T(1/2) \quad (33)$$

$$H(1,-) = H(1/2,-)T(1/2) + H(1,+)R(1/2) \quad (34)$$

C=0

C= 1/2

H (1/2,+)

FIG. 1,46 Using invariant imbedding ideas to calculate internal irradiances from boundary irradiances.

Here we know H(1,+), and we have more relations for H(1/2,±) with another unknown H(1,-).. But now we have four equations in four unknowns which we can solve for H(1/2,±), and rearrange as follows.

$$H(1/2,-) = H(0,-) x''(0, 1/Z, 1)$$

$$H(1/2_1+) = H(0_1-)j\sim Z(0_1/2p_1)$$

where for the present example:

$$* \quad H(1,+).dn(1.1/2.0) \quad (35)$$

$$+ H(\quad p+)_v^*+`r(1_9/2p_0) \quad (36)$$

$$\sim Z \sim T \sim 1/a \quad _ .006$$

$$-R (1/2)$$

$$_ .600 \quad (38)$$

$$_ G \sim (0,1/2,1) _ a(1 \cdot 112_10) = R \sim 1-R^2 (1/2)$$

Hence:

$$H(1/2,-) \quad 500.x _ ,600 + 100 \ 341 \text{ watts/m}^2$$

$$H(1/2,+)= 500$$

$$63 \text{ watts/m}^2$$

$$*006 + 100$$

$$_ .006$$

$$_ .600$$

Equations (35)-(38) are special cases of the important invariant imbedding relations we shall study in many contexts later. If the reader has understood the deductions in this example, he will have no difficulty with the deductions in the remainder of this work concerning invariant imbedding concepts, for they are merely elaborations of the present simple example to general geometries and radiometric quantities. It suffices to observe here that the a and J factors are the complete reflectances and complete transmittances for the medium $X(4,1)$ partitioned at level $l/2$. More general partitions generally yield four such numbers.

• With the preceding numerical examples in mind, we may now apply (2b), (27) to the following situation which generalizes the setting of Fig. 1.46. Thus, being guided by Fig. 1.47 in which all depths are optical depths we have, for the medium $X(a,b)$

$$H(a,+) = H(a,-)R(b-a) + H(b,+)T(b-a) \quad (39)$$

$$H(b,-) = H(a,-)T(b-a) + H(b,-)R(b-a) \quad (40)$$

Applying (26), (27) again, now to $X(b,c)$

$$H(b,+) = H(b,-)R(c-b) + H(c,+)T(c-b) \quad (41)$$

$$H(c,-) = H(b,-)T(c-b) + H(c,-)R(c-b) \quad (42)$$

b

$H(a,)$

FIG, 1,47 General arrangement for calculating internal irradiances at level b from given irradiances at levels a and c , using the invariant imbedding relation.

80 INTRODUCTION VOL. I Solving these four equations for $H(b,t)$, we have, analogously to (35) v (36)

where:

$$H(b,-) = H(a,-)T(a,b,c) + H(c,+)R(c,b,a), \quad (43)$$

$$H(b,+) = H(a,-)R(a,b,c) + H(c,+),T(c,b,,a), \quad (44)$$

$$j R (a , b T b-a R c-b$$

, c), (45)

$$1-R(b-a) R(c-b),$$

$T b-a$

$$, T (a , b , c), (46)$$

$$1-R(b-a) R(c-b),$$

$$j 9 (c , b , a) T (c -b) R(b-a), (47)$$

$$1-R(b-a) R(c-b),$$

$$0 T(c, b., a) T(c-b), (48)$$

$$1-R(b-a) R(c-b)$$

which are the general versions of (37), (38). These may be evaluated using the R and T values tabulated above.

Equations (43), (44) together constitute the invariant imbedding relation for the medium $X(a,c)$ which is partitioned at level b , as $b \leq c$ and in which irradiance is the radiometric

concept of interest. It may be put into compact matrix form as follows:

$$r = X(C, b, a) Q(c, b, a)$$

$$1 \quad 1(49)$$

$$12(a, b, c) Zr(a, b, c)$$

If the one-D model proves inadequate to predict or describe a given radiometric condition in a natural hydrosol, it may be that a more general and flexible model is required.

The hierarchy of successively more refined irradiance models that may be tried after the present one is as follows: the *decomposed one-D model*, the *undecomposed two-D model*, the *decomposed two-D model*; these are studied in Chapter 8.

For a reversal of the preceding procedures in which the light field in real media may be measured so as to predict $R(T)$ and $T(T)$, see Examples 1, Z, in Sec. 13.14.

SEC. 1.4 SOME DEDUCTIONS 11

A Theoretical Basis for the Law: $N_*(z, e) N_*(O, O)e$

$_k_z$

In our derivation of the simple model for radiance leading to (14) of Sec. 1.3 we assumed that the path function N_* decreased exponentially with depth, as indicated in (13) of

Sec. 1.3. We shall now do away with the assumption and deduce *this form of N_** with the help of the two-flow model. This will place (13) of Sec. 1.3 on a sounder basis and also show how the simple models occasionally may be used to help each other attain their full descriptive powers.

Now the path function value $N_*(z, e)$, as defined, gives the amount of radiance generated by scattering at depth z , per unit length along the direction E of a path in a hydrosol,

as shown in Fig. 1.39. What is scattered is the radiance at depth z impinging on the path in all directions E' . Just how much of the stream in the direction E' is scattered into the direction $_$, at depth z is given by means of the volume scattering function values $a(z; E'; _)$. Thus

$$N_*(Z) = \int_0^{\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} a(z; E'; _) N_*(z, E') d\Omega$$

where the notation " S ." and " $d\Omega(E')$ " is explained in Sec. 1.1. We shall carefully define $_o$ and derive (5D) from first principles in Chapter 3. For the present we can understand it on simple intuitive grounds, as just explained.

The two-flow model assumes that the radiance distribution $N(z, \bullet)$ has an arbitrary fixed shape in the upper and lower

hemispheres of the unit sphere of directions $_$. If we assume in particular that for every depth z

$N(z, \bullet)$ on $_+$ has the constant value $N_+(z)$

and that

$N(z, \bullet)$ on $_-$ has the constant value $N_-(z)$

then (50) yields up the following necessary form of N_* :

$$N_*(z, \bullet) = N_+(z) \delta(\bullet - _+) + N_-(z) \delta(\bullet - _-)$$

$_y$

12 INTRODUCTION VOL. I

In the two-flow model adopted in this chapter, the medium is assumed isotropic and *homogeneous*. * Further, the light field is such that the path direction E can be characterized by a single angle θ as shown in Fig. 1.39. We can therefore write, *ad hoc*:

$$I(z, \theta) = I_0(z) \exp(-\int_0^z \sigma(\theta) dz) \quad (52)$$

A
M

gap,

We shall also write:

$$I(z, \theta) = I_0(z) \exp(-\int_0^z \sigma(\theta) dz) \quad (53)$$

so that,

$$I(z, \theta) = I_0(z) \exp(-\int_0^z \sigma(\theta) dz) \quad (54)$$

The quantity σ is simply the volume total scattering function introduced during the derivation of the simple model for radiance. The portion of the scattering lobe used in finding $\sigma(\theta)$ is shown unshaded in Fig. 1.39. In view of these conventions, we can write:

$$N(z, \theta) = N(z) \sigma(\theta) + N(z) (\sigma - \sigma(\theta)) \quad (55)$$

From (11) of Sec. 1.1 it is clear that,

$$H(z, -) = nN(z), \quad (56)$$

$$H(z, +) \sim \tau N(z), \quad (57)$$

and from (57), (56) and (5) we have:

$$N =$$

$$N = R_w, \quad (58)$$

Therefore,

$$N(z) = N(0) \exp(-\int_0^z \sigma dz) + R_w \int_0^z \exp(-\int_0^z \sigma dz) \sigma dz \quad (59)$$

We are essentially finished, because by (B), (11) of Sec. 1.1 we have (setting C equal to k)

$$h(z) = h(z, +) + h(z, -)$$

$$2H(z, +) + 2H(z, -)$$

$$2n(R_{OD} + 1)N(z) \quad (60) \text{ MMM}$$

Using this in (59) and recalling (7), we find:

* *Homogeneity* means σ is independent of z ; *isotropy* means σ depends only on θ .

SEC. 1.4 SOME DEDUCTIONS 12

$$+ R_w \int_0^z \sigma dz \quad (e)$$

$$N(z) = N(0) \exp(-\int_0^z \sigma dz) + R_w \int_0^z \exp(-\int_0^z \sigma dz) \sigma dz \quad (59)$$

$$2n(1 + R_{OD})$$

$$\sigma N(0, \theta) \exp(-\int_0^z \sigma dz) \quad (61.)$$

where:

$$\sigma \sim \frac{h(0) + R_w \sigma}{2n(1 + R_w)}$$

$$N(0)$$

$$2n(1 + R_w)$$

$$(62)$$

which is the desired result. In practice we can therefore use the theoretical k and the empirical K interchangeably. This derivation also shows how, using (S_0) , one can generalize the construction of $N^*(0,8)$ to quite realistic angular dependences using existing light fields at or somewhat below the air-water surface. The unshaded region of the o-lobe in Fig. 1.30 shows the portion of the three dimensional surface of $o(z; \sim; \&)$ over which the integration taken place to obtain $s(e)$, $O : s \ 9 \ s = w$. Observe that if $s(9)$ is a surface of revolution (as it is in practice) then:

$$S(e) + S(Y-8)$$

(63)

whence;

$$s(n/2) = s/2$$

and in particular:

$$s(0) + s(n)$$

As an example of the use of (62) we observe that in some Pacific coastal waters (cf.

[300]) as measured in the wavelength band of a Wratten 57 filter, we have

$$s(0) _ :001/m$$

$$s(n) _ .013/m$$

Observe that $s(0)$ acts like a backward scattering function for collimated flux, whereas $s(n)$ acts like a forward scattering function for collimated flux, so that by (b3)

$$s(0) + s(n) = S = .014/m$$

This water was also found to have a corresponding volume absorption coefficient of $a = .104/m$, and hence the medium has an $a = .118/m$. Such water is highly forward scattering and also relatively highly absorptive, and will therefore force the simple models to work hard in their descriptive tasks. Since the present medium is highly absorptive, the downward scattered daylight light near the surface will be relatively highly collimated. Accordingly we assume a relatively small distribution factor D , say $D = 1.1$. Since the medium is highly forward scattering, we shall estimate the backward scattering coefficient b for the scattered flux field to be $.042/m$. It follows from the one-D two-flow model ((9) of

13 INTRODUCTION VOL. I

1.3 and (9) of 1.4 that $aD _ .114$, and that $k = .114/m$ along with $y = .99$; so that $R, = .01$. Let $h(0) = 500 \text{ watts/m}^2$ just below the surface.

These assumed conditions allow us to illustrate the path function formula (62).. We have, for the downward path function just below the surface:

$$N^*(01W) \quad \frac{h(0) \{ s(n) + R_s(0) \}}{2n (1+Rw)}$$

$$= \frac{500 \cdot .013 + .01 \times}{(1 + .01)}$$

$$= 1.03 \text{ watts /m}^3\text{sr}$$

$$= 1.03 \text{ herschels/m}$$

6.28

Further, for the horizontal path function:

$$N^*(0,9 \cdot w/2) \frac{h(0) \{ [1 + \&] s, \quad sh \}}{4n [1+R] \quad 4a}$$

$$= \frac{500 \times .014}{4 \times 3.14}$$

$$= .57 \text{ herschels/m}$$

Finally, for the upward path function:

$$N^*(0,0) = \frac{h(0) [s(Q) + S(n)1.21 [1+Rco]]}{50.01 \times 0.01 + 0.01 \times 0.0136.28(1+.vl)}$$

= .080 herschels/m.

Computing Radiances from the Simple Model

Some illustrations of the computation of radiances using (14) of Sec. 1.3 will help fix in mind the typical orders of magnitudes of radiance values in natural waters. Let us begin with the case of a horizontal path of sight some given depth z_0 below the surface. Then in (14) of Sec. 1.3, we set $e = w/2$, and that equation becomes

(64)

SEC. 1.4 SOME DEDUCTIONS 14

which we can write quite simply as:

$$N = N e^{m ar} + \frac{N^*}{1 - e^{-a r}} \quad (14)$$

provided the depth and direction of the path are understood. (The right is reserved to disinter the depth and direction variables at any time.) For infinitely long horizontal paths, i.e., for the case $r = \infty$, this formula yields:

(65)

for the observable horizontal radiance N at a given depth in any laterally extensive stratified optical medium. Observe that in such media the N_q defined above does not change with location along the path. For this reason we denote the observable radiance as " N_q " and call it the *equilibrium radiance*.

An estimate of N_q for shallow depths in Pacific coastal water around the blue-green part of the spectrum can be made on the basis of the preceding example, wherein we found that $N^*(0,v/Z) = .557$ herschels/m; In such waters, for example, $a = .104 + .414 = .518$ /m. Hence:

$$N(0, \infty) = .557 / .518 = 1.075 \text{ herschels}$$

is the equilibrium radiance just below the surface. At a depth of 5 meters, it follows from (61) that

$$N(5, \infty) = \frac{N^*(0, \infty) e^{-a z}}{1 - e^{-a z}} = \frac{1.075 e^{-.518 \times 5}}{1 - e^{-.518 \times 5}} \approx 0.560 \text{ herschels}$$

$$N_q(0, \infty) e^{-5k}$$

$$= 4.72 \times e^{(.5)}$$

$$4.72 \times .560$$

(66)

2.64 herschels

where we have used the k for the water of the preceding example.'

As another example of the use of the radiance model, we set $e = w$ and $e = 0$ in (14) of Sec. 1.3, to find that, at depth z at the lower end of a vertical path of length r :

(66)

and similarly at depth z , at the upper end of a vertical path of length r :

±

00

$$N_r(z,0) = N_0(z_0,0)e^{-a}$$

$$\frac{N^* L z \sim}{(67)} (a+K) r a+K$$

15 INTRODUCTION VOL. I

The reader is reminded of the standing convention that $N_r(z,n)$ is the apparent radiance at depth z flowing in the downward direction and to see it, one must direct his eye or radiance meter upward (cf. Fig. 1.39), we persist in using this form of radiance (i.e., surface radiance) because it simplifies the dynamics of photons in scattering-absorbing media.

Suppose the medium is infinitely deep, so that we can set $r = a$ in (67) and still keep the path within the medium. Then (67) becomes: which is the radiance one would see at depth z looking straight down into the infinite deeps. Suppose $z = 0$, then our preceding example lets us estimate that.

$$N(0,0) = N^* 0 0$$
$$a+ K '6080$$

.344 *herschels*,

Let the zenith radiance as seen just above an air-water surface be 80 *herschels* in a given band width of the blue green part of the spectrum, say at $480 \pm 64 \mu$, and suppose that $h(0) = 504$ watts /M2 just below the surface. If the surface is calm, then just below it, by virtue of the n^2 -law for radiance, (Sec. 1.1), we would have

80

$$4 \frac{2}{3}^3$$

142 *herschels*

where $4/3$ is the index of refraction of water. This radiance value is to be modified slightly if surface transmittance and reflectance effects are to be included. These corrections are of secondary importance and so we shall not include these effects at the moment. Now, to the present task: we can estimate $N(z,n)$ for $z = S$ meters, by means of (66) in which we set $z_0 = 0m$, $z = Sm$, and use $a = .118/m$, $k = .115/m$. Thus, with the help of our estimate of $N^*(0,w)$ above:

$$N_s(r) = N_0(1) e^{-a z} e^{-k z}$$
$$= 142 \times .554 + (1.03 \times .560) = 78.6 + 2.88$$
$$= 81.5 \text{ *herschels*}$$

107

10 20 30 40 50 60
 DEPTH - METERS

FIG. 1.48 Experimental verification of the simple model for radiance, as measured by Tyler in Lake Pend Oreille, Idaho, April 1957. (From [298]. by permission)

The next to last equality shows that at a depth of 5 meters, 7866 herschels are transmitted from the original 142 just below the surface, and that 2.88 herschels are added by the process of scattering over the 5 meter path.

Figure 1.48, which is based on the work in [298], shows the observed radiance distribution in Lake Pend Oreille and its associated predicted values using (14) of Sec. 1.3 for

three important directions. The solid curve is computed from the model, the dots denote measured radiances.

A word or two may be in order here on the rather unintuitive-seeming jump by the radiance function as the flux crosses the air-water surface: We saw in the example above

how it jumped from 80 to 142 herschels. To simplify matters suppose for the moment that there are no losses by reflection as the flux crosses the surface, Fig. 1.49 depicts the flux

16 INTRODUCTION VOL. I

FIG. 1.49 To show that the irradiance conservation law holds despite the nx effect on radiance at the air-water level.

incident at a point A on the surface, flowing in from all directions in a hemisphere. The refracted rays below the surface do not fan out in a full hemisphere, but are limited to a right circular cone of half angle $e_c = 48^\circ$, or more precisely,

Let the incident radiance distribution be f constant magnitude N . Then the irradiance on the air-water surface, by (11) of Sec. 1.1, is simply wN . Let us compute the irradiance just below the surface produced by the refracted incident flux of radiance $(4/3)^2 N$. By (1) of Sec. 1.1 we now find:

$$e_c \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{e_c} N \cos \theta' \sin \theta' d\theta' d\phi' = 3 \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{e_c} \cos \theta' \sin \theta' d\theta' d\phi'$$

$$\cos \theta' \sin \theta' d\theta'$$

This shows that, despite the rather odd buildup of refracted radiance across the air-water surface, this buildup is of such a magnitude, and takes place over such a restricted set of directions, that, as expected, energy conservation is observed. The argument just given can readily be extended to ideal transmitting surfaces bounding media of arbitrary index of refraction. When, in addition, reflection processes are to be taken into account, the more extensive calculations discussed in Sec. 12.2 are to be used.

Derivation of the Contrast Transmittance Law and the Radiance Difference Law

The contrast transmittance law:

$$I_r = (a + K \cos^2 \theta) I_0$$

for an inclined path of sight of length r in a homogeneous optical medium was first encountered experimentally (in the special instances of vertical and *horizontal* directions) as explained in the discussion leading up to (12) of Sec. 1.2. It is now our purpose to show how this law may be deduced from the simple model for radiance (14) of Sec. 1.3, and under what conditions it is expected to hold.

Let the hydrosol X be infinitely deep and consider a path in X as shown in (a) of Fig. 1.54, where the observer is at depth z and the apparent radiance $I_r(z, \theta)$ of an object of inherent radiance $I_0(z, \theta)$ is observed. The angle θ is such

FIG; 1.50 Setting for a theoretical proof of the exponential law for apparent contrast. (cf. Figs. 1.29, 1.34)

17 INTRODUCTION VOL. I

that $\theta = 0$ is the angle from the vertical at which the photons are flowing, as shown by the arrow in the figure.

Now the background apparent radiance $I_{br}(z, \theta)$ for the present path of length r is obtained from (14) of Sec. 1.3 by setting r in that general equation:

$$I_{br}(z, \theta) = I_0^* \exp(-z/\delta) \quad (68)$$

This is the apparent radiance of the background of the target as seen at a range r from the target. The *apparent contrast* $C_r(z; \theta)$ of the object against its background (recall (11) of Sec. 1.2) is:

$$C_r(z, \theta) = \frac{I_r(z, \theta) - I_{br}(z, \theta)}{I_{br}(z, \theta)}$$

$$C_r(z, \theta) = \frac{I_r(z, \theta)}{I_{br}(z, \theta)} - 1 \quad (69)$$

wherein we have:

$$I_r(z, \theta) = I_0(z, \theta) \exp(-z/\delta)$$

$$I_0^* \exp(-z/\delta) = I_0(z, \theta) \exp(-z/\delta) \quad \text{Or} \quad I_0^* = I_0(z, \theta) \quad (70)$$

Observing that:

(71)

it follows from the preceding four relations, by straightforward substitution of (68) and (70). into (69),, and a reduction using (71), that:

(72)

which was to be shown. The quotient C_r/C_o is called the *contrast transmittance*, Equation (72). is the requisite contrast transmittance law. The quantity $(a+K \cos \theta)^{-1}$ is called the *attenuation length* L_e of the medium along the given path, For $e= r/2$, $L_w/2= 1/a$, a basic property of the medium, while $L_o = 1/(a+K)$ is associated with secchi disk readings (cf. (84). below). The quantity $4L_e$ is mainly of historic interest and is the hydrologic range for the given path of sight. Its plot is an ellipse vs. θ (cf. $S^1ec^* 1:9$).

This simple derivation cannot be repeated in its entirety when the photons are streaming in from a nearby boundary, such as depicted in (b) of Fig. 1.40. In this case (68) must be replaced by the full form of (14) of Sec. 1.3. However, by using (69) and (71) , which are general definitions of apparent and inherent contrasts, along with (14) of Sec. 1.3

SEC. 1.4 SOME DEDUCTIONS 91

once again, it follows readily by a similar calculation, that quite generally:

(73)

The reader may show that this formula holds for both situations depicted in Fig. 1.50, i.e., for $0 \leq e \leq \pi/2$. It reduces to (72) when $0 \leq e \leq \pi/2$, i.e., when (14) of Sec. 1.3 reduces to (b8). A fuller discussion of contrast and contrast transmittance is given in Chapter 9.

Figures 1.51 and 1.52 illustrate two experimental checks of the contrast transmittance law for the cases of $e = 90^\circ$, and $e = 58.8^\circ$. The radiometric quantity used was apparent luminance B_r , and the medium (Lake Winnepesaukee, N.H.) had an a of $.490/m$ for Fig. 1.51 and for Fig. 1.52 the medium had $a = .585/m$ and $K = .350/m$. These optical properties therefore pertain to averages of a , K over the visible spectrum. The observation point in each case was about a meter below a calm air-water surface and when the skies were overcast or early 1:0

FIG. 1.51 Experimental checks of the exponential law for apparent contrast (cf. Fig. 1:50) by Duntley, Tyler, and Taylor, Lake Winnepesaukee, N.H., Summer 1958.

45

FIG. 1.52 Experimental checks of the exponential law for apparent contrast (cf. Fig. 1.51).

morning skies in each case. Further details may be found in 83]

44

We conclude with the observation of a useful corollary. of (73), namely that *radiance differences propagate exactly according to the exponential law. Thus*

$$[b N_r(Z_1 e) \cdot t N_r(Z_0 e) \sim a C_b J$$

Contrast Transmittances for General Backgrounds

It should be observed explicitly that formula (73) is of such generality that the apparent contrast C_r of an object need not be with respect to a water background. Rather, if bN_0 in (73) is the inherent radiance of a background (as in Fig. 1.53) for a target of inherent radiance tN_0 (shaded in the figure), then by computing bN_r according to (14) of

SEC. 1,4 SOME DEDUCTIONS 93

FIG. 1.53 Contrast transmittance *far* paths with arbitrary backgrounds.

Sec. 1.3 and using this in (73), the requisite apparent contrast transmittance C_r/C_0 is determinable.

As a special case of (74) under these circumstances, let the line of sight be *horizontal*, then it is easy to see that.

(7S)

where N_q is the equilibrium radiance for the given horizontal path. Observe that the contrast transmittance of the given path uses only the radiances bN_0 and N_q , i.e., the radiances making up the immediate background of the target. Of course in real media N_a is somewhat affected by both tN_0 and bN_0 (and conversely) so that the classically simple formula (75) does not rigorously hold. But within the framework of the present simple models and for paths of sight under ordinary lighting conditions, (75) is a quite useful and adequate formula* .

The Multiplicative Property of Contrast Transmittance

If we take a still closer look at the contrast transmittance law (73), we find a most interesting property held by contrast transmittance in general, whether it be for paths of sight within the sea, or within the atmosphere, or even for paths partly in the sea *and* partly in the atmosphere!

To facilitate our discussions let us write:

94 INTRODUCTION VOL* I

for C_r/C_0

and *when* necessary we include location and direction variables with " ~r", Now observe that e-ar in (73) can be written as

$$N_0(z \sim 8) e^{-ar} b r$$

$N(z, 0)$ b o t

where N^0 is the residual radiance coming directly from the b target background over the path of length r . (It is what is left of bN_0 after scattering and absorption have taken their toll; cf. (24) of Sec. 1.3). Then we see that (73) can be cast into the form:

On this basis, we can work solely with the background radiance of a target when discussing beam transmittance of a path along which it is viewed. Hence we need no longer carry the reminder "b" before the radiance symbol. In other words we find that for a general path of length r in a general hydrosol, the contrast transmittance. C/C_0 of the path is given by

$$\frac{N_r}{N_0} \quad (76)$$

This situation is summarized schematically in (a) of Fig. 1.54.

Next, suppose we have two paths of length r, s , end to end, as shown in (b) of Fig. 1.54. Let the inherent radiance at the far end be N_0 . Then at the end of the first path segment of length s , we have, according to the preceding rule:

-a

$$N_s \sim 0 \quad (77)$$

N_s, N_s

where N_s is the apparent radiance associated with N_0 and N_s the residual radiance associated with N_0 .

over the path of length s , both reckoned via (12) of Sec. 1:3, for example. The apparent radiance N_s now acts as did the initial radiance N_0 , and N_s is transferred over the second segment of length r to give rise to an observed residual radiance $N_s e^{-ar}$ and the apparent radiance N_{r+s} associated with N_s . Hence:

$N e^{-ar}$

N_{r+s}

$$(78)$$

SEC. 1.4 SOME DEDUCTIONS 20

FIG. 1.54 Part (a): Deriving the contrast transmittance as the ratio of a residual radiance and an apparent radiance. Part (b)'. Deriving the multiplicative (or semigroup) property of contrast transmittance:

But looking at the path as a whole, we can also write:

$$N^0 \quad (79)$$

Comparing (77)-(79) we find:

(80)

This is the multiplicative (or semigroup) property of the contrast transmittance. The argument just used to derive (80)

is readily extended without change of the form of (84) to arbitrary paths in air or water and across places where the index of refraction varies, provided in such cases we work with N/n^1 rather than N , where n is the index of refraction. For by the n^2 -law for radiance, N/n^2 is invariant in transparent media with varying index of refraction (see Sec. 9.5).

As an obvious extension of (80), if a path consists of three contiguous, successive segments of arbitrary lengths r, s, t , then the contrast transmittance $J_{r0'+}$ of the composite path is simply a product of the three contrast transmittances of the segments:

9b INTRODUCTION v6t. I

$$J: r+s+t^a - x^d s it$$

J
(81)

As an example of (81), consider a calm air-water surface. A line of sight of length t begins at a submerged object, is refracted at the air-water surface, and runs a length r in the air. Each of the three paths have an associated contrast transmittance* While the path across the surface is of zero length, i.e., $s = 0$, there is a definite contrast reduction that takes place because of reflected sky light and reflected and transmitted underwater light occurring at the surface. The form of this singular contrast transmittance J^0 is given in detail in (20), (23) of Sec. 12.2.

If, in addition, the air-water surface is in motion, then the above analysis must include an additional factor T_0 ($m C/C$) associated with the time-averaged contrast reduction by refraction (cf, in (5) of Sec. 1.2). Hence now:

$$X_{r+t} = X_V \sim \sim o \sim t$$

(82)

gives the time averaged contrast transmittance J_{r+t} for a path of length r in air, and going across a moving air-water surface and plunging a length t in a natural hydrosol (Fig. 1.55). The factors are as follows for a vertical line of sight in air and a small submerged target of half-angle subtense α as seen just below the surface:

$$\begin{matrix} \text{(in air)} \\ \sim J_t = e^{- (a^2 + K) t} \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \text{(in water)} \end{matrix}$$

(at the interface)

Fit

is as given in (21) of Sec. 12.2 (wherein $N^0(x, V) e_0$, is now the time averaged vertical upward radiance). The complete analysis of the time averaged radiance transmitted across the air-water surface is made in the latter

half of Chapter 12, wherein the more or less **intuitive type of factor** analysis in (82) is bypassed in a direct, more general, but somewhat more difficult solution of the problem.

Theory of the Secchi and Duntley Disks

it is a part of almost everyone's experience to have thrown or dropped an object into deep water and to have watched it disappear into the depths, If the object is

SEC.' 194 SOME DEDUCTIONS 97

FIG. 1,55 Contrast reduction along a composite path through air, air-water surface, and water,

something bright or white, the eye can easily follow it down into the depths until it seemingly abruptly winks out, to be lost from sight from some depth onward. If the observer were of an inquisitive turn of mind, he may surmise that the general clarity of the water had something to do with the depth at which the object disappeared, and he may wonder if there were indeed a-quantitative connection between the depth rate of decay of the light field in the water and also the depth rate of decay of the whiteness or contrast 'of the sinking object against the watery background, and maybe even the depth at which it seems to wink into obscurity.

Here is a hypothetical discussion about the radiometric problem of the sinking object, defined above, and which may occur on shipboard between a young eager theorist just learning the ropes and a seasoned experimenter in hydrologic optics just-after one of them had accidentally dropped a white glass coffee mug over the side of the oceanographic research vessel (which was moored in deep calm water at the time). Theorist; There you go, being careless with your design of experiments again.- You didn't even note the sun altitude or what filter you were using.

Experimenter: I had an irresistible urge to see what would happen if I dropped it in,

Th. Good heavens man! Why the experiment? Have you for

gotten Archimedes Law? On theoretical grounds, I predict that the mug will sink!

Recovering from the accident) Look--it's turning billions as it sinks deeper. What an interesting transformation of shades and hues. It looks like it's down 10

meters by now and I can still see it quite clearly! The (peering down over the railing) It must have reached terminal velocity by now and is surely sinking according to Stokes' law. (Looking at his watch, then a pause) At the sound of the tone it will be exactly 20 meters.

22 INTRODUCTION

VOL. I

(Ignoring the other's babbling) There it goes. I lost

track of it. There's no doubt about it, this is pretty clear water!

What's the *alpha and the kay for this water? Did you measure it again this morning?*

It's the same-as yesterday. The alpha's about a tenth

"" per meter and the kay is about fifty thousandths per meter, both in the green.

What are you doing?

Th. (Jotting something on a piece of paper so that the other can see it) I'M bet I can connect the mug's depth of disappearance with the alpha and kay of this water, (Smiling wearily to himself, and then with a sigh);

Here we go again. Take it easy, Einstein, my calculus is buried under a ton of barnacles.

The We really don't need it. Didn't you explain to me how it's known that the light level generally goes down exponentially with depth in deep water like this? I can use this fact to figure out how much light gets to the mug at each depth z . It would be (*writing on the paper*)

$H_0 e^{-Kz}$ correct?

Yes, and let's say that H_0 is the irradiance *on a horizontal* surface just below the surface and K is the kay *for this water*, namely, .U54/m. So you can figure out the irradiance on a horizontal surface at depth z . (Then feigning puzzlement) where does that get you?

The Why, this lets you compute the inherent radiance of the mug at depth z , if you know its reflectance,

Ex. Do you know it?

No, but let's just call it "R". Then (writing again)

$R(H_0 e^{-Kz})$ would give an estimate of the radiance reflected upward by the mug.

Ex. Hmm---Yes, but that's its *inherent* radiance down at depth z . Here we are on deck.

Th. I see what you mean, So we need the apparent radiance of the mug, But that'll mean knowing the path radiance generated by scattered light between us and the mug and also the effect of the air-water surface. Gosh, all that's pretty hard to come by isn't it?

Ex, Quite. But if you remember what I told you the other day about radiance *differences*, . . .

Th. Radiance *differences*? Oh, of course! They are transmitted exactly according to the exponential law e^{-Kz} for beamed light, Let's see, the radiance difference in this case will be between the inherent radiance of the mug at depth z and the inherent radiance of the background water at the same depth. Such a difference is easy to figure.

Ex. Is it? Again you don't know the reflectance of the water at the depth of the mug. At least I haven't measured it yet for this place.

The That's O.K. Let's call the reflectance of the water "R.". It could not be much different from .02 for all depths. I was looking over some of your old reports, and review articles yesterday. Everywhere you measured R. you got something around .02 for green light, even some deep clear lakes and ponds, nest ce pas?

Ex. (Gritting his teeth) I am afraid so, Very few

SEC. 1.4 SOME DEDUCTIONS 99

surprises left there. Well, where are you leading me next with your paper and pencil?

Th. The average radiance **of the water** background at depth z is simply R . times the downward irradiance at that depth. That is, we would have $R_0(H_0 e^{-Kz})$. Right?

Ex. Yes, except for a factor of n --but they'll all cancel out anyway in the end. So don't worry about it now. Th. (Looking up surprised) Say--how do you know that? Have you worked all this out before?

Ex. (With a straight face, looking out at the horizon) Not exactly. On with it--what is your next step?

The Well here is the radiance difference between the mug I_m and the sea at depth z :
$$H_0 e^{-Kz}$$

Ex. And then?

Th. And then at long last I can use the radiance difference law. That is I multiply this difference by e^{-az} to transmit it up to just below the surface--where it'll be what we will actually see if we went there. Thus:

$$I_m e^{-Kz} - H_0 e^{-Kz} e^{-az}$$

Can you simplify this mess? Sure, like this.

$$(a+K) z$$

$$H_0 (R - R_0) e^{-az}$$

Ex. Also I don't like to bother with absolute light levels. *Can you take care of that, too?*

Th. Yes, I suppose, Why not divide the whole thing by the amount of reflected radiance, from the sea just below the surface? Like this:

$$\frac{H_0 (R - R_0) e^{-az}}{H_0 R_0}$$

$$\frac{R - R_0}{R_0}$$

Ex. *That'll* work fine. Now, what have you got for all your trouble?

Th. (A pause, and then) Why this looks like it could be a *kind of contrast* reduction formula...yes, it is ... just let $H_0 (R - R_0) / H_0 R_0$, or simply $(R - R_0) / R_0$, be the inherent contrast of the mug against its background. It looks like this contrast is independent of the depth of the mug. *That's fantastic! Is that right?*

Ex. (Blanching) Yes, go on...

Th. So if the apparent contrast of the mug at depth z as

seen from just below the surface is C_z , then it looks like we have

$$C_z = \frac{R - R_0}{R_0} e^{-(a+K)z}$$

$$C_z = C_0 e^{-(a+K)z}$$

(A little startled at the equation's quick appearance

from an unexpected line of argument) Would you know how to use something like that?

The (After a while) Well, if we can agree that the mug

24 INTRODUCTION

VOL . I

disappears when C_z/C_0 is some small number, maybe like $1/50$, and measure the z for such a ratio, then we can compute the corresponding $a+K$. It's true we couldn't find a and K separately this way, but the sum is probably still a good index of water clarity.

Ex. (In mock anger) Incredible! Do you know what you've just done, boy?

Th. (Somewhat aghast) No, sir. But I do know that we haven't allowed for the surface effects yet. Is something wrong?

Ex. No, it's just that throughout this discussion I've seen

" several old friends in a new light. You did well, Now, you run along below and get me a fresh mug of coffee. And on the way back drop into the ship's library. I want to show you something in Sec. 1.4 of "Hydrologic optics"~ It wasn't long until the young theorist saw how to derive the contrast law in the orthodox way (see, e.g., (72)) and how to put in the contrast transmittance factors for the surface, as we have seen for ourselves in (82). It was also made clear to him how Secchi (283] had many years before, in 1865, devised an empirical procedure of just this type for finding a water clarity index which used the depth of disappearance of a standardized disk, and finally of how the meticulous care with which Secchi had stated his measuring procedures had generally been ignored or diluted by subsequent generations of users of his method.

In 1949 Duntley (S2] examined the Secchi disk procedure and devised a simple alternative scheme whereby it would be less subject to the vagaries of individual experimenters and

lighting conditions during the moment of disappearance of the disk. Duntley observed that one important seat of the difficulty of using Secchi disk readings lay in coping with the contrast transmittance factors ρ and τ in (82) (the factor ρ is essentially unity for work ρ above the surface).

Suppose then, Duntley reasoned, that two disks were *used*, one being white, the other gray. Suppose further that the two disks are lowered together, side by side into the water a meter or two or so below the water surface, say to depth z . An observer above the surface will see them side by side; a white and a gray disk--each a bit dimmer now, but their luminances still quite distinct. Then the white one is slowly lowered farther into the water, the other being held fixed. As it is lowered, the white disk becomes darker (the e^{-Kz} effect setting in) and soon, at some depth d below the gray disk, there appears to be a luminance match between the two disks (see Fig. 1.56). At this stage of the experiment, we see that by (72) and (82):

$$C_z = C_0 e^{-(a+K)z} \sim_0$$

for the gray disk, and that.

$$C_{z+d} = C_0 e^{-(a+K)(z+d)} \sim_0$$

SEC. 1.4 SOME DEDUCTIONS 101

for the white disk, and indeed, that:

$$C_z = C_{z+d}$$

(As they stand, either of these formulas for C_z or C_{z+d} by itself comprises the theory of the Secchi disk.) By taking the ratio of these contrasts, we eliminate the troublesome contrast transmittances T_0, T_0 , to find:

$$e^{-(a+K)d} = \frac{C_{z+d}}{C_z} = \frac{R' R z_0}{R' R z_0}$$

$$e^{-(a+K)d} = \frac{C_{z+d}}{C_z}$$

$$C_{z+d} = C_z e^{-(a+K)d}$$

(83)

Flenpe

(84)

Using the experimental fact that in green light R is on the order of .0Z (but of course with some variation possible) for most natural hydrosols, and that the R of the gray disk and the R' of the *white* disk may be easily chosen much greater than the R of the water to be measured, (S4) can be written very nearly as,,

(85)

Since the number $\ln(RI/R)$ is known and fixed for a pair of disks, a table can be made from which one can read off $a+K$ directly from the match-depth-difference d .

Suppose further that someday an optical oceanographer equipped with a scuba and a light-weight pair of Duntley

Z+ d

FIG. 26.56 The Duntley-disk procedure for measuring $a+K$.

26 INTRODUCTION VOL. I

darker disk

lighter disk

r

FIG. 1.57 The Duntley-disk procedure for measuring $a-K$, disks on a rod (as in Fig. 1.57) will be able to measure *the* match-depth-difference d for a vertically upward line of sight. Then *from an analysis* based either on the kind of reasoning by the young theorist in the dialogue above or by simply appealing to (72) with $e = 180^\circ$, we could deduce that, analogously to (85):

40

(86)

From this and (85), we find.

and

r

s)

If such a device is used, it should have sectors (or perhaps *annuli*) on *each* disk of different whites and grays (when the diver looks upward the darker disk must be farther from him at match time). It is also suggested that the divers wear goggles which transmit in some given small hand width of the spectrum around which the K and a values are to be determined. A readily used band width would be centered on the

blue-green or yellow-green peaks of transmittance of most natural waters. Some care must also be given to the adaptation of the diver's eyes to the *general* level of illumination in which the visual match is best made. The importance of levels of illumination *in underwater visibility tasks will be illustrated as a matter of course* in Sec. 1.9.

SEC 01* 4 SOME DEDUCTIONS 103

Theory of Absorption Measurements in Natural Hydrosols

It is probably a continual source of fascination for highway patrolmen to examine the daily tallies of vehicles *that pass over* certain continuous road segments on super highways or relatively desolate roads located between consecutive toll houses, and occasionally to be rewarded with a positive net influx of cars across a given segment. That is, when they subtract from the recorded number of vehicles entering the segment for each day the number of vehicles leaving the segment that same day they occasionally find a positive *difference!* From a purely phenomenological point of view, this means that some vehicles have been absorbed in their passage through the given stretch of highway! Of course, if the tally is correct, this could mean for example that there exist stalled vehicles somewhere along the segment, and a patrol is usually dispatched to investigate,

The principle of detection of the absorption of photons in a given layer of natural hydrosol is exactly analogous to the toll house tally procedure for wayward vehicles described above. In Fig. 1.58 a laterally extensive layer of water between two levels y and z in a stratified optical medium is monitored by irradiance meters measuring $H(y, \pm)$ and $H(z, \pm)$. The total influx of irradiance to the layer is $H(y, -) + H(z, +)$, and the total efflux is $H(y, +) + H(z, -)$. Therefore the net influx of irradiance is

$$[H(y, -) + H(z, +)] - [H(y, +) + H(z, -)] = I_{\text{net}}$$

FIG. 1.55 The principle for determining light absorption in a layer of natural hydrosol.

By the same general reasoning leading to (2) we find that (as. in the case of the one-D model) in all real natural hydrosols wherein there are no internal sources of radiant flux, this difference is positive, indicating that some fraction of the entering photons is continually being absorbed within the layer. The nature of the absorption is two fold: if a tally is being kept only of photons of a given color (frequency) then the absorption in this case includes scattering with change in color. Secondly, absorption could mean the transformation of radiant energy into non-radiant energy. In practice both of these mechanisms are operative, The

difference $H(y, -) - H(z, -)$ is a direct measure of the amount of radiant flux absorbed by a column of unit horizontal cross section bounded by the upper and lower planes of the layer of water. If a is the volume absorption coefficient of the (homogeneous) layer, then this quantity is directly measurable by means of the relation:

a

$Z y$

(89)

$h(z') dz.'$

provided a probe -is sent down to find the values $h(z')$ of the scalar irradiance between depths y and z . The reader may check that (89) follows directly from (16) of Sec. 1.3. Hence (89) is an exact formula for homogeneous media with a stratified light field. A discussion of (g9) and a systematic *derivation of the* related formulas below is given in Sec. 13.8.

A local version of (89) comes from (16) of Sec. 1.3 directly:

(90)

To use (90), one need only measure $h(z)$ at depth z , and also $h(z, +)$ in a small neighborhood of depths about depth z , so as to be able to compute the derivative of $H(z, +)$ at that depth, This method is exact for all inhomogeneous stratified media

An instrument to measure a , and which is based on the principle represented by (94), has been devised by Tyler [299] at the Visibility Laboratory

It is important to notice two essential features of (90). First, observe that scalar (rather than ordinary irradiance) is used to normalize the derivative; second the net irradiance is used in the derivative. Now it turns out that of these two features, it is the first that is of critical importance and which gives the formula its distinctive power in natural hydrosols, To see this, recall from the preceding discussions that the reflectance $R.$, for green light is **quite small in clear deep media**, the kind found in most oceanic work, for example, Hence in:

SEC. 1.4 SOME DEDUCTIONS loS

$$H(z,+) = H(z,+) - H(z, -)$$

and in

$$I'(z) = a(z) I(z, +)$$

$$h(z, -)$$

we can ignore with a fair measure of impunity the terms $I(z, +)$ and $h(z, +)$. In that case, (90) becomes:

$$a(z)$$

$$dH/dz$$

$$h(z, -) dz$$

Furthermore, by virtue of the distribution factors D_+ defined in the two-flow model, we can write:

$$h(z, -) = D_+ I(z, -)$$

$$(91)$$

In addition, if we estimate $I(z, -)$ by means of the exponential law:

$$I(z, -) = I_0 e^{-Kz}$$

(where K is obtained either via the one-D model, as in (9) of Sec. 1.3, or empirically), then (91) yields:

$$a =$$

$$D_+ I(z, -)$$

$$-K D_+$$

$$(92)$$

This points up the critical importance of the scalar irradiance $h(z)$ in (90); for if we used $H(z,+) + H(z, -)$ in its place, then we would have (90) yield up the estimate K

(wrong)

which is clearly false. Indeed, the factor D_+ is often on the order of 1.0-2.0 in natural optical media with values clustering about 1.3 for blue-green light, so the use of H rather than h to normalize the derivative in (90) could lead to errors anywhere from 0 to 100 percent in the estimate of $a(z)$, but mostly on the order of 30 percent.

From (90) we can also obtain a crude but occasionally useful estimate of the *rate of absorption of radiant energy per unit volume of a layer of water*, First

$$dH/dz = a(z) I(z) : (93)$$

is the exact formula for the required depth rate of absorption, i.e., of net influx of irradiance to a unit layer at depth z . It is simply the product of $a(z)$ at depth z with $h(z)$ at depth z . Now if we again drop off $H(z, +)$ and $h(z, +)$ as being small compared to $I(z, -)$ and $h(z, -)$, we have:

29 INTRODUCTION VOL. I

$$dH/dz =$$

$$a(z) h(z)$$

$$dz$$

$$= -a(z) D_+ I(z, -)$$

as the depth rate of absorption of radiant flux per unit volume at depth z . The last approximation comes from (92) and by means of the exponential law for irradiance. It should be noted that (93) is exact only for stratified media. If one wishes to compute exactly the rate of absorption of a small volume of water in a general light field in a generally inhomogeneous optical medium he may use (1) of Sec. 13.8 and the general instructions given there.

As an illustration of (90) as a means of estimation of the volume absorption coefficient, consider the sample light field given in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Irradiance and Scalar Irradiance in Lake Pend Oreille Idaho. (Relative values)

$z(\text{meters})$	$N(Z, \bar{z})$	$h(Z, \bar{z})$	$h(z, +)$
4.24	721,000	15,500	899,404 41,900
10*42	329,000	6,040	413,000 16,500
16,58	109,000	2,230	141,000 6,190
28,96	13,100	298	17,200 830
41.30	1,660	39	2,190 108
53.71	221	5	289 14

These data were obtained by Tyler, Richardson, and Holmes from radiance distribution measurements in Lake Pend Oreille, Idaho [306]. Radiance filters were centered on $480 \pm 64 \text{ m}\mu$. *Observe first that D at 4.24 meters is 1.25, and that its value at 53.71 meters is 1.31.* This shows, incidentally, the general magnitude of D : found in most natural waters for bluegreen light. Similar values may be found at the other depths. By computing the slope of the $H(z, +)$ -plot derived from the tabulations above, and using the computed $h(z)$ values, it was found via (90) *that the lake was essentially homogeneous with an a on the order of .117/m.* The μ_k for this medium was found to be .169/m, and $a = .442/m$.

We can invert the formulas (89) and (90) to find the rate of absorption of radiant energy in a given medium, given the volume absorption function and some radiometric samplings of the medium. For example in infinitely deep media in which

SEC, 1.4 SOME DEDUCTIONS 107

scalar irradiance decreases according to the exponential law, we can estimate the total rate of absorption as follows. In (89) set $y = 0$ and $z = 0$ so that $H(0, 0) = 0$:

This leaves:

$$H(0, z) = a \int_0^z h(z') dz'$$

Using the exponential law for $h(z)$:

$$h(z) = h(0) e^{-Kz}$$

That is:

$$H(0, z) = \frac{a h(0)}{K} (1 - e^{-Kz}) \quad (94)$$

This formula holds actually for any depth z below the surface. (Simply multiply each side by e^{Kz} .) If z is used in place of 0 , then $H(z, 0)$ in (94) is a measure of the radiant flux absorbed by the entire medium below the level z .

As an illustration of (94), suppose that $h(0) = 250$ watts /M2 on some sunny day just below the surface, for the wavelength band $480 \pm 64 \mu$. The total rate of absorption throughout the lake per square meter of lake surface is therefore:

$$H(0, \infty) = \frac{1.117}{K} \times 250 = 173 \text{ watts/m}^2$$

The remaining power, namely $250 - 173 = 77$ watts/m² goes on to initiate and sustain the scattered light field within the body of the lake.

As another illustration of (94), suppose that measurements of $H(y, z)$ and $h(y, z)$ are made at some depth y in a deep homogeneous medium, and also that K is known for the same wavelength interval. We can then estimate a as follows.

From (94):

$$K H(z, y) = h(z)$$

For example, from Table I, at depth 28.96 meters, we have $H(28.96, y) = 13,100$ - 298

$$12,802 \text{ watts/m}^2$$

$$= \dots$$

(95)

Also,

$$h(28.96) = h(28.96, y) e^{-Kz} = 13,100 e^{-.120 \times 28.96} = 18,030 \text{ watts /M2}$$

$$18,030 \text{ watts /M2}$$

108 INTRODUCTION VOL. I

Hence

$$.169$$

$$12,802 = .120 \times 18,434$$

$$= .120/m$$

which agrees to within .003/m with the estimate .117/m for a obtained by light field measurements using (90).

We conclude with some observations on the radiant energy content of natural hydrosols, a *concept which is closely* related to the absorption concept presently under discussion. Recall *the* general relation between scalar irradiance $h(z)$ and radiant density $u(z)$ as given in (5) of Sec. 1.1:

$$u(z) = v h(z) \quad (96)$$

Here v is to the speed of light in homogeneous water:

$$= 2.25 \times 10^8 \text{ m/sec}$$

By integrating $h(z)$ from the surface ($z = 0$) down to depth z in an infinitely deep medium we find:

$$U(z) = \int_0^z u(z) dz \quad (97)$$

$$= \int_0^z h(z) v dz = \frac{h(0)v}{K} (1 - e^{-Kz})$$

provided h follows the exponential law. This gives the amount of radiant energy $U(z)$ in a vertical column of unit horizontal cross section with upper end at the surface and *lower end* at depth z . Observe that by (89) *this also can be written*

MEME

$$U(z) = \frac{h(0)v}{K} (1 - e^{-Kz})$$

va

For very shallow media, (98) yields $\sim \frac{h(0)v}{K} Kz$

a

$$h(z) \sim h(0) e^{-Kz}$$

(98)

(99)

For very deep media (98) yields

(100)

In the present medium, (Lake Pend Oreille) which is very deep, with $K = .169/\text{m}$ and $h(0) \sim 250 \text{ watts/m}^2$ (say), we find

$U(0)$

250

$$2.25 \times 10^8 \times .169$$

$$\times 10^1 \text{ joules/m}^2$$