







An integrated approach to Acoustics - sound propagation and the phenomena affecting it

IOA LONDON BRANCH EVENING MEETING,

WSP | PARSONS BRINCKERHOFF

PRESENTATION BY PANOS ECONOMOU OF PEMARD, 19TH APRIL 2017





PART 1: INTRODUCTION – FROM OPEN SPACES TO ROOMS

IMPEDANCE VS ABSORPTION COEFFICIENT

REVIEWS OF MODERN PHYSICS, VOLUME 16, NUMBER 2 APRIL, 1944, Sound Waves in Rooms, PHILIP M. MORSE AND RICHARD H. BOLT

Morse and Bolt in their 1944 paper say on page 87: "It has been demonstrated in a number of ways that the absorption coefficient entering into the geometrical acoustical formulas is not a fundamental property of the wall surface.... It is an average property, averaged for the particular distribution of sound which we have called "ergodic" in the previous section, and has no meaning in cases where the sound distribution is not ergodic. It is well to emphasize this limitation on the use of the term absorption coefficient, for an over-optimistic use of the term may lead to erroneous results.... It is true that the impedance is not a much more "fundamental" physical property than the absorption coefficient; its advantage lies in the fact that its measurement can be specified concisely and uniquely and that its value for a given material has a definite meaning no matter what the distribution of sound inside a room."







PART 1: INTRODUCTION – FROM OPEN SPACES TO ROOMS

SPHERICAL & GROUND WAVES

"...Practically, one never has plane waves. They are a mathematical fiction which can be only approximated physically." Isadore Rudnick, 1947, JASA VOLUME 19, NUMBER 2, "The Propagation of an Acoustic Wave along a Boundary"









"A ground wave occurs when the incident sound field spreads spherically, as from a small source near the ground, and so reaches different parts of a plane surface with different angles of incidence. Changing angles of incidence produce a reflection coefficient that varies with position along the surface....The result is that there cannot be an image I in the ground that is spatially a replica of the true source S, and not even one of reduced strength. Theoretical analysis shows that there is a "fuzzy" image distributed over an extensive region. It is strongest at the expected location but extends to infinity both horizontally and downward."

Tony F. W. Embleton: Sound propagation outdoors

J. Acoust. Soc. Am., Vol. 100, No. 1, July 1996







PART 1: INTRODUCTION – FROM OPEN SPACES TO ROOMS

142

PHILIP M. MORSE AND RICHARD H. BOLT



FIG. 31. Angles and distances involved in computing the reflection of a spherical wave from an absorbing wall. "Therefore any argument which assumes that the reverberant sound can be represented by a multiplicity of simple images is likely to lead to fallacious results. The analyses of Sabine, Norris, Eyring, Millington, and Sette are subject to this criticism".

REVIEWS OF MODERN PHYSICS, VOLUME 16, NUMBER 2 APRIL, 1944, Sound Waves in Rooms, PHILIP M. MORSE AND RICHARD H. BOLT







Theodore J. Schultz in his paper "Persisting questions in steady-state measurements of noise power and sound absorption" starts with, "....in view of the great number of recent studies on this subject, the reverberation room seems to be turning into a "research object" rather than a "useful tool."it is almost incredible to me that we could produce such a complex and mysterious thing, just by putting up four walls, a floor and a ceiling, and then radiating sound into it. And yet the more we study sound in an enclosed space, the more peculiar it seems. If our earlier theories made the behavior of sound in rooms appear simple, our recent studies are certainly correcting that naive view."

"Persisting questions in steady-state measurements of noise power and sound absorption" Theodore J. Schultz, JASA Volume 54 Number 4 1973





A REFLECTION OVER A SURFACE – IS THERE MORE THAN ONE ANSWER TO THE PROBLEM?





1: Spherical wave, Impedance, pressure summation

The figure on the left shows the configuration while the figure on the right Excess Attenuation in dB (the ratio of total over direct sound field).







2: Plane wave, Impedance, pressure summation –







3: Plane wave, absorption coefficient, pressure summation.







4: Plane wave, absorption coefficient, energy summation.







PART 1: INTRODUCTION – FROM OPEN SPACES TO ROOMS



Tony F. W. Embleton: Sound propagation outdoors J. Acoust. Soc. Am., Vol. 100, No. 1, July 1996 FIG. 6. Relative sound pressure levels measured 5 m from a point source at the surface of an acoustically soft ground (grass). Results are for four different receiver heights, $h_r = 0.02$, 0.3, 0.6, and 1.2 m, respectively (Ref. 13, Fig. 5).





SOUND DIFFRACTION



PART 1: INTRODUCTION – FROM OPEN SPACES TO ROOMS









THE SEAT DIP EFFECT USING WAVE BASED GEOMETRICAL ACOUSTICS (WBGA), ECONOMOU ET AL, ICSV23, JULY 2016



PART 1: INTRODUCTION – FROM OPEN SPACES TO ROOMS



THE SEAT DIP EFFECT USING WAVE BASED GEOMETRICAL ACOUSTICS (WBGA), ECONOMOU ET AL, ICSV23, JULY 2016

IOA-LONDON BRANCH APRIL 19TH 2017, WSP I PARSONS BRINCKERHOFF,







THE SEAT DIP EFFECT USING WAVE BASED GEOMETRICAL ACOUSTICS (WBGA), ECONOMOU ET AL, ICSV23, JULY 2016





THE P. E. MEDITERRANEAN ACOUSTICS RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT (PEMARD) APPROACH





What is Wave Based Geometrical Acoustics (WBGA)?

It is the method by which the calculation of acoustical fields take into account the principle of superposition of waves using both amplitude and phase, producing interference phenomena.







SOUND REFRACTION IN THE ATMOSPHERE





Figure 2: Comparison between OTL-Suite calculations (red line) and 1995 Benchmark Cases (black line). Left graph is for the case of a strong positive linear sound speed gradient of 0.1 s⁻¹ while the right graph is for the case of a strong negative sound speed gradient of -0.1 s⁻¹. Both curves show transmission loss vs distance at 100Hz. Calculated graphs are superimposed on published data.

WIND TURBINE NOISE PREDICTION USING OLIVE TREE LAB TERRAIN, WTN, INCE-EUROPE, BIGOT, ECONOMOU, MAY 2017









Figure 7: Left graph: Measured and predicted noise levels for WTN Case 2. Right graph: Measured and predicted Noise Levels for Case 2 in dB(A) for a set of 10-minute meteorological data. Downwind conditions with a range of 500m.

WIND TURBINE NOISE PREDICTION USING OLIVE TREE LAB TERRAIN, WTN, INCE-EUROPE, BIGOT, ECONOMOU, MAY 2017







Bent sound rays and multiple ground reflections due to downwind conditions, On the left, few rays for clarity and on the right 1000 sound paths.

WIND TURBINE NOISE PREDICTION USING OLIVE TREE LAB TERRAIN, WTN, INCE-EUROPE, BIGOT, ECONOMOU, MAY 2017



























ISO 9613 vs PEMARD APPROACH





Figure 1: Geometry of set up in Terrain, Hs=0.3m, Hr=1.2m, Hb=3m, Dsr=35m, HG=GFR=20 MNs/m⁴, PG=GFR=300 kNs/m⁴



Figure 2: Validation of Isei's geometry from ^{Error! Reference source not found. Calculations are superimposed on graph courtesy of Attenborough et. al. (a) Insertion loss of barrier with Hard and Porous Ground effects. In colored dashed lines PEMARD results which are almost indistinguishable from the original graphs, in solid lines and markers the ISO results. (b) Excess Attenuation with barrier in place, colored dashed lines represent PEMARD results.}



Isei's geometry, barrier height 3m, thin & wide, Hard vs Porous Ground



Figure 1: SPL spectra, L_{pA} and L_p values based on Isei's geometry, HG=GFR=20 MNs/m⁴, PG (SG)=GFR=300 kNs/m⁴ (a) Hs=0.3m, Hr=1.2m, Hb=3.0m, Dsr=35m, (b) Hs=0.3m, Hr=1.2m, Hb=1.5m, 1m thick barrier, Dsr=35m.





Figure 1: Sound propagation over porous ground in relative levels (10 dB/division), (a) in octave bands between 63 and 500 Hz and (b) from 1000 and 8000 Hz. HG=GFR= 20 MNs/m⁴, and PG=GFR=300 kNs/m⁴, with Hs=5m and receivers at Hr=1m every 10m from the source up to 200m.





Figure 1: Sound spectra at various distances from the source over hard ground. The legend includes dB(A) values at each distance from the source, (a) ISO results, (b) PEMARD results. HG=GFR= 20 MNs/m⁴, and PG=GFR=300 kNs/m⁴, with Hs=5m and receivers at Hr=1m every 10m from the source up to 200m.





Figure 1: Sound spectra at various distances from the source over porous ground. The legend includes dB(A) values at each distance from the source, (a) ISO results, (b) PEMARD results. HG=GFR= 20 MNs/m⁴, and PG=GFR=300 kNs/m⁴, with Hs=5m and receivers at Hr=1m every 10m from the source up to 200m.



PART 2: PEMARD APPROACH



Figure 1: PEMARD results demonstrate how the -6dB/dd rule does not apply over finite impedance ground, (a) over hard ground, (b) over porous ground. Any deviation from zero indicates that the rule does not apply.







ROOM RESONANCES





USING WAVE BASED GEOMETRICAL ACOUSTICS (WBGA) TO INVESTIGATE ROOM RESONANCES, JOHANSSON, ECONOMOU, BNAM, JUNE 2016





Figure 1: Mapping on the left is at 1721 Hz (higher by a scale factor of 10, experimental data, courtesy of the JASA) while the coloured mapping in the 1/3rd octave band of 200 Hz. The mapping on the right is at 2302 Hz (higher by a scale factor of 10, experimental data) while the coloured mapping in the 1/3rd octave band of 250 Hz. In red high sound levels and in green low [5].





DIFFRACTION EFFECTS




Real Time Sound Path Propagation in Courtyard using ACOUSTICS-LID

the Rosetta Stone of Acoustics Library by PEMARD







Figure 1: On the left, the 3D full scale model used for our calculations. On the right Ando's results compared to experimental data. Our calculations are superimposed as a red curve over the original graph by Ando (courtesy of the Journal of the Acoustical Society of America).

THE SEAT DIP EFFECT USING WAVE BASED GEOMETRICAL ACOUSTICS (WBGA), ECONOMOU ET AL, ICSV23, JULY 2016





THE SEAT DIP EFFECT USING WAVE BASED GEOMETRICAL ACOUSTICS (WBGA), ECONOMOU ET AL, ICSV23, JULY 2016



APPLICATIONS OF WBGA SOUND REFLECTIONS OFF A MIXING CONSOLE





APPLICATIONS OF WBGA SOUND DIFFRACTIONS OFF A MIXING CONSOLE





APPLICATIONS OF WBGA SOUND DIFFRACTIONS WITH IN BETWEEN REFLECTIONS OFF A MIXING CONSOLE







APPLICATIONS OF WBGA SOUND REFLECTIONS & DIFFRACTIONS (ALL) OFF A MIXING CONSOLE







STUDYING THE PHENOMENON - REVERBERATION



122

PHILIP M. MORSE AND RICHARD H. BOLT









FIG. 1. "Reverberation Time" (?) of small broadcast studio.

"..... at the frequencies of the lowest resonant modes of the room, there is very little absorption by the walls and hence the reverberation time is high; whereas at frequencies only a few cycles away from the resonance there is a much shorter reverberation time and, therefore, the walls must be much more absorptive. Presumably if the room were a different size, the absorption dips (hence, reverberation peaks) exhibited by the walls would occur at different frequencies corresponding to the new modes of the room. **One can hardly believe that the ordinary rigid, bare walls of a room could show such wide (and variable!) differences in absorption within such a narrow frequency range. What, then, is the trouble with these curves? Surprisingly, there appear to be at least three methods of measurement which would give this kind of wrong answer!" (Courtesy of JAES, from Theodore Schultz's paper "Problems in Measurement of Reverberation Time",** *Journal of The Audio Engineering Society***, 11**(4), 307-317, (1963))







Figure 9: Detailed view of the 100 Hz 1/3 Octave Band frequency range (a) from Fig. 8a above and (b) from Fig. 8b. Spherical reflection factor was used for RT calculations. The dashed curves (----) represent the RT curves for the individual resonance peaks while the solid curve shows the envelope of the superimposed resonance peaks.

BEYOND SABINE: INVESTIGATING THE ACOUSTICAL PHENOMENON OF REVERBERATION USING ROOM MODAL DECAY, UPCOMING ICSV24, ECONOMOU ET AL, JULY 2017





Figure 5: Sound decay in a small rectangular room. Plane vs spherical wave propagation. BEYOND SABINE: INVESTIGATING THE ACOUSTICAL PHENOMENON OF REVERBERATION USING ROOM MODAL DECAY, UPCOMING ICSV24, ECONOMOU ET AL, JULY 2017









Figure 7: Sound decay with and without sound edge diffractions.

BEYOND SABINE: INVESTIGATING THE ACOUSTICAL PHENOMENON OF REVERBERATION USING ROOM MODAL DECAY, UPCOMING ICSV24, ECONOMOU ET AL, JULY 2017





THE MUNICIPALITY BUILDING OF LATSIA – CYPRUS, AN EXAMPLE OF THE INTEGRATED APPROACH IN ACOUSTICS

















Edit View Database Help Updates





















TRAFFIC NOISE AFFECTING LIBRARY GLAZING & THE EFFECT OF NOISE BARRIER

























DESIGNING THE LIBRARY WALL USING THE TRANSFER MATRIX METHOD (TMM)







B Multilayered Structure Builder (Project)	- 🗆 X
Structure Name: Demo Library Wall	Export To Clipboard Front->Back Back->Front
Structure Category: PEMARD STRUCTURES V	Impedance Abs. Coef. SRI Tables
Material Selection	
Material Filters	14K 8K
Material Type: Porous 6 parameters V Material Category: Porous V	
Materials:	12K
FOAM FR 10.9k A C Parameter Value A	
FOAM FR 50k Flow Resistivity [Pa s/m2] 34000	6K
Mineral wool Porosity 0.95	10K
Porous Material 2	
Add Material Add Air Laver	E
	о 8К
Layered Structure Editor	g g 4K m _
12.5 mm 9 mm 75 mm 12.5 mm 9 mm 50 mm 10 mm	
rd/Plasterbo wool rd/Plasterbo 17.7k 19.6%Ф=8	4K
X J X J X J X J X J X J X J	2K
	2K
00000000000000000000000000000000000000	
Selected Laver Total Width 178 mm	10 100 1000 10000
Parameter Value ^	
Young's Modulus [10^9 Pa] 3.3	Frequency, Hz
Damping Loss Factor 0.01	
Density [kg/m3] 860 Save New Structure	Real Imaginary





.....

10000











INVESTIGATING STI USING ISO 3382-3:2012









Paths								Ļ	×			
Path	s to Rend	er		Paths Info:								
\bigcirc A	II Paths			Paths	Detected	d: 80	Paths \$	Selected:				
۰ د	elected P	aths		Paths	Rendere	d: 6						
ID	Name	Distanc m	R	D	Time ms	EA	Real	Imagina	^			
0		16.521	2	0	48.136	-1.62	0.036	0.044				
1		16.271	2	0	47.407	-1.86	-0.04	0.027				
2		15.590	2	0	45.424	-4.88	-0.03	0.017				
3		14.393	0	1	41.936	-5.85	0.033	-0.00				
4		15.995	0	1	46.604	-7.02	0.022	0.021				
5		14.414	0	1	41.998	-9.02	0.022	0.009				
6		16.017	0	1	46.667	-10.26	0.001	0.021				
7		14.649	0	1	42.683	-12.63	-0.00	0.015				
8		14.828	0	1	43.202	-15.17	0.004	-0.01				
9		14.528	0	1	42.330	-20.37	-0.00	0.003				
10		26.924	0	1	78.448	-21.95	-0.00	-0.00				
11		22.985	0	1	66.969	-22.38	0.004	0.001				
12		14.591	0	1	42.512	-22.54	-0.00	-0.00				
13		19.137	0	1	55.758	-23.92	0.002	-0.00				
14		17.980	0	1	52.388	-23.95	-0.00	-0.00				
15		14.616	0	1	42.586	-24.68	-0.00	-0.00				
16		17.342	0	1	50.528	-25.17	-0.00	-0.00				
17		24.949	0	1	72.693	-26.21	0.000	-0.00				
18		21.040	0	1	61.303	-26.48	-0.00	0.001				



Calculation Name	STI Nearest Station	Distraction Distance, rD (m)	Privacy Distance, rP (m)	Decay rate of A-weighted SPL of speech (dB)	A-weighted SPL of speech at 4m (dB)	Average A-weighted BNL (dB)
Calc 5 After	0.48	24.86	0	-1.17	50.67	49.65
Calc 5 Bef	0.48	24.86	0	-1.17	50.67	49.65











INVESTIGATING THE THEATRE USING ISO 3382-1:2009











Impulse Respon	Room Acoustics	Auralisation														
Decay			O Clarity and Strength	O Definition	⊖ STI ⊖ Room Param											
Paramet	ers Sabine	RT Criteria	C50 C80 G Strength	D50												
☐ T20 ✓ T30	 Eyring Centre Time 	RT at 500 Hz: 1.00 🖨				Impulse	e Response Roor	m Acoustics Au	ralisation			 Clarity 	and Strength	(Definition	○ STI ○ Room Pararr
□ T60			Show Averages				Parameters	bine		RT Crite	ia	✓ C50	🖌 C80 🖌	G Strength	D50	
Graph Table										RT at 500 Margin	Hz: 1.00 🔹	Shov	v Averages			
Autoscale	Log X Axis					Grapi	h Table									
] [T30 Before	Calc 1 Average Abs Coeff Rec 3 Eyring Befo	re Calc 1 Average Abs Coeff Rec 3				Frequency	C50 Before	C50 After	C50 Average	C80 Before	C80 After	C80 Average	G Strength Before	G Strength After	G Strength Average
2.5	Max RI			· · · ·			31.5	-3.446	-3.446	-3.446	-0.111	-0.111	-0.111	11.632	11.632	11.632
†					1		40	-3.622	-3.622	-3.622	-0.294	-0.294	-0.294	11.83	11.83	11.83
]		50	-4.081	-4.081	-4.081	-0.768	-0.768	-0.768	12.358	12.358	12.358
20		\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \					80	-3.094	-3.094	-3.094	-0.266	-0.266	-0.266	11.229	11.229	11.229
2.0					1		100	-3.721	-3.721	-3.721	-0.396	-0.396	-0.396	11.945	11.945	11.945
+							125	-3.66	-3.66	-3.66	-0.332	-0.332	-0.332	11.875	11.875	11.875
1 1					1		160	-3.227	-3.227	-3.227	0.116	0.116	0.116	11.38	11.38	11.38
" 1.5 –		λ					200	-2.229	-2.229	-2.229	1.158	1.158	1.158	10.253	10.253	10.253
₽́ †					1		250	-0.769	-0.769	-0./69	2.713	2./13	2./13	8.6/5	8.675	8.675
10 1	à à				1		400	-1.151	-1.151	-1.151	2.304	2.304	2.304	9.085	9.085	9.085
l se l							500	-1.543	-1.543	-1.543	1.886	1.886	1.886	9.504	9.504	9.504
1.0 +							630	-1.78	-1.78	-1.78	1.635	1.635	1.635	9.764	9.764	9.764
1 1					1		800	-1.813	-1.813	-1.813	1.6	1.6	1.6	9.8	9.8	9.8
+							1000	-2.221	-2.221	-2.221	1.169	1.169	1.169	10.249	10.249	10.249
0.5					j		1250	-2.261	-2.261	-2.261	1.127	1.127	1.127	10.298	10.298	10.298
0.0			*]		1600	-2.207	-2.207	-2.207	1.131	1.131	1.131	10.294	10.294	10.294
0.0 -	· · ·		10 ⁴													
















PART 3: AN EXAMPLE OF INTEGRATED ACOUSTICS















PART 3: AN EXAMPLE OF INTEGRATED ACOUSTICS









THANK YOU

WWW.PEMARD.COM