

**Using Multipath Interference to Probe Subsurface Soil Properties  
on Mars and Beyond**

By

Harvey Elliott

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
(Atmospheric, Oceanic and Space Sciences)  
in the University of Michigan  
2018

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Nilton O. Renno, Chair  
Associate Research Scientist, Roger D. De Roo  
Associate Research Scientist, Darren S. McKague  
Professor, Christopher S. Ruf  
Professor, Kamal Sarabandi

Harvey M. Elliott

[helliott@umich.edu](mailto:helliott@umich.edu)

ORCID iD: 0000-0003-0224-9419

© Harvey M. Elliott 2018

## **Dedication**

*In loving memory of my mother, who always encouraged me to reach for the stars.*

*Ad Astra*

## **Acknowledgements**

This work was sponsored by JPL grant #1515900 and #1538905 and was from the beginning a collaboration between JPL and the University of Michigan. First, I would like to thank my advisor, Nilton Renno, a man I once asked for advice about applying to graduate schools and who later invited me to join his research group. I'm grateful for this opportunity!

At the University of Michigan, I would like to thank Chris Ruf who was instrumental in the creation of the first ray tracing model. Roger De Roo who I can credit with many edits to Chapter 3. Darren McKague who has been a trusted and loyal advisor since I took his Space Systems Design and Management course back in 2010. This work has also benefited from the efforts of several other students. In particular, Edward Lopez, Ammar Abbas, Jovan Makrievski, Razmi Khan, Kris Klassen, and Cauê Borlina who assisted me with the sandbox testing. Tal Down who took on translating the ray tracing model from MATLAB to C#. Matthew Regan, Adelina Nastasiou, Mitchell Drew, and Ohsuk "Ryan" Kwon who fleshed out a proposal to do this measurement using a small satellite transit of Phobos.

Finally, I would like to thank my collaborators at JPL starting with Bob Preston who was part of this work from the beginning and gave me my first tour of "the lab." Joe Lazio for his encouragement and support of this work. Dave Bell for his endlessly optimistic attitude. Curtis Jin, Emmanuel Decrossas, Yonggyu Gim, and Xueyang Duan for conducting the experiments with a mockup of the Mars 2020 rover in the wash. And finally, Kamal Oudrhiri, for his work on the original MARRSI proposal, the Korean Pathfinder proposal, and everything else! Thank you!

# Table of Contents

<b>Dedication</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>List of Acronyms</b>	<b>xii</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>xv</b>
<b>Chapter 1. The Martian Environment</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Ground Penetrating Radar	3
1.3 Interferometric GNSS-R	4
1.4 The Martian Atmosphere: Temperature, Pressure and Humidity on Mars	5
1.5 Research Objective	7
<b>Chapter 2. The Relative Permittivity of Water, Ice and Soils</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 Pure Liquid Water and Brine	8
2.2 H <sub>2</sub> O and CO <sub>2</sub> Ice	9
2.3 Soils	10

<b>Chapter 3. The EM Propagation Model</b>	<b>14</b>
3.1 Introduction to Electromagnetic Waves	14
3.2 The Poynting Vector	17
3.3 Polarization of an EM Wave	17
3.4 Path Loss in Free Space Transmission	18
3.5 Reflection and Transmission at Interfaces Between Media	19
3.6 Absorption Due to a Lossy Media	27
3.7 Interference Resulting from the Phase Offset Between Two Signals	28
3.8 Antenna Gain	30
3.9 Doppler Effect Due to Relative Motion	35
<b>Chapter 4. Model Applications</b>	<b>37</b>
4.1 The Link Budget for the Path	37
4.2 A Surface Reflection and the Resulting Interference Pattern	39
4.3 Adding a Second Soil Layer	41
4.4 Measuring the Properties of a Soil Layer Through Use of the Reflectivity and Interference Pattern at Various Incidence Angles	44
4.5 Measuring the Properties of a Soil Layer Through Use of the Reflectivity and Interference Pattern at Various Frequencies	61
<b>Chapter 5. Laboratory Experiments</b>	<b>70</b>
5.1 Sandbox Setup and Geometry	70
5.2 Lab Results: Reflection off an Aluminum Plate	77
5.3 Lab Results: Reflection off a Concrete Slab	78
5.4 Lab Results: Interference Pattern Resulting from a Changing Incidence Angle	79
5.5 Lab Results: Interference Pattern Resulting from a Changing Frequency	84
5.6 The Impact of Rocks and Periodic Ripples	89

<b>Chapter 6. Applications to Mars and Other Planetary Bodies</b>	<b>96</b>
6.1 The Deep Space Network and a Circularly Polarized Signal	96
6.2 Data from the Opportunity Rover	97
6.3 Capabilities of the Curiosity Rover	103
<b>Chapter 7. Conclusions</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>111</b>

## List of Figures

Figure 1. The soil texture categories as defined by the mass fraction of Sand, Silt or Clay (Russell, 1957).	11
Figure 2. The electromagnetic spectrum with radar frequency bands as defined by IEEE Standard 521-2002.	16
Figure 3. A simple ray tracing model depicting an EM wave as a “pencil” or a “laser beam” of radiation.	18
Figure 4. A ray encountering an interface between Media 1 and Media 2 as defined by their dielectric properties, in three dimensions.	20
Figure 5. Reflection coefficients for the interface between air and dry soil, wet soil, and sea water; V-pol (solid), H-pol (dashed).	25
Figure 6. An infinite two-layer model with a ray encountering an interface.	26
Figure 7. An infinite two-layer model where Media 2 is lossy.	28
Figure 8. Pasternack PE9857/NF-15 Radiation Pattern.	32
Figure 9. Radiation pattern of the High Gain Antenna on the MSL spacecraft.	33
Figure 10. Radiation pattern of the High Gain Antenna on the MER spacecraft.	34
Figure 11. Radiation pattern of the Rover Low Gain Antenna (RLGA) and Petal Low Gain Antenna (PLGA) on the MER spacecraft.	35
Figure 12. The direct signal between two standard gain horn antennas.	37
Figure 13. Geometry of a two-ray model with a reflection off the ground.	39
Figure 14. Geometry of a three-ray model with a second interface in the subsurface.	41
Figure 15. Example of an internal reflection within the soil layers.	43
Figure 16. Model geometry used to generate the interference patterns seen throughout sections 4.4 and 4.5.	45
Figure 17. Reflected power V-pol (blue) and H-pol (red) as a function of incidence angle from a one-layer soil model.	46



Figure 18. Reflected power V-pol (blue) and H-pol (red) as a function of incidence angle from two-layer soil model with various depths of dry sand on top of concrete.	48
Figure 19. Comparing the two-layer interference pattern to the one-layer reflection profile of dry soil ( $\epsilon_s = 2.34 - 0.01i$ ) and concrete ( $\epsilon_c = 4.95 - 0.69i$ ).	50
Figure 20. Reflected power RHCP (yellow) as a function of incidence angle from two-layer soil model with various depths of dry sand on top of concrete.	51
Figure 21. Procession of the interference pattern as a function of incidence angle in 1 mm depth increments from 9 cm to 10 cm, V-pol (blue) and H-pol (red), for a two-layer soil model of dry sand on top of concrete.	52
Figure 22. Procession of the interference pattern in 0.1 mm depth increments for $\epsilon_1 = 2.34 - 0.01i$ (top), $\epsilon_1 = 2.76 - 0.10i$ (middle), and $\epsilon_1 = 3.25 - 0.25i$ (bottom).	53
Figure 23. An interference pattern from a two-layer model showing the null spacing ( $\Delta\theta_i$ ), magnitude ( $\Delta P$ ), and inflection point.	54
Figure 24. The Brewster angle for an interface between air and the top layer of soil.	55
Figure 25. Relationship between the depth of the first layer ( $d_1$ ) and the number of nulls for $\epsilon_1 = 1.5$ (top), for $\epsilon_1 = 2.0$ (middle) and for $\epsilon_1 = 2.5$ (bottom).	56
Figure 26. Relationship between the depth of the first layer ( $d_1$ ) and the number of nulls for $\epsilon_1 = 3.0$ (top), for $\epsilon_1 = 3.5$ (middle) and for $\epsilon_1 = 4.0$ (bottom).	57
Figure 27. Relationship between the depth of the first layer ( $d_1$ ) and the null spacing ( $\Delta\theta_i$ ) for $\epsilon_1 = 1.5$ (top), for $\epsilon_1 = 2.0$ (middle) and for $\epsilon_1 = 2.5$ (bottom).	59
Figure 28. Relationship between the depth of the first layer ( $d_1$ ) and the null spacing ( $\Delta\theta_i$ ) for $\epsilon_1 = 3.0$ (top), for $\epsilon_1 = 3.5$ (middle) and for $\epsilon_1 = 4.0$ (bottom).	60
Figure 29. Reflected power as a function of frequency for a one-layer soil model.	62
Figure 30. Interference pattern from a two-layer soil model where the thickness of the top layer is fixed at 5 cm, but the relative permittivity is allowed to change.	63
Figure 31. Interference pattern as a function of frequency from a two-layer soil profile with dry soil on top of concrete.	64
Figure 32. Procession of the interference pattern in 1 mm depth increments from $d_1 = 9$ cm to 10 cm.	65
Figure 33. An interference pattern from a two-layer model showing the null spacing ( $\Delta f$ ) and magnitude ( $\Delta P$ ).	65

Figure 34. Relationship between the depth of the first layer ( $d_1$ ) and the null spacing ( $\Delta f$ ) for $\epsilon_1 = 1.5, 2.0, 2.5, 3.0, 3.5,$ and $4.0$ .	66
Figure 35. Relationship between the depth of the first layer ( $d_1$ ) and the null magnitude ( $\Delta P$ ) for $\epsilon_1 = 1.5, 2.0, 2.5, 3.0, 3.5,$ and $4.0$ .	67
Figure 36. Relationship between the incidence angle ( $\theta_i$ ) and the null spacing ( $\Delta f$ ) for $\epsilon_1 = 1.5$ (top), for $\epsilon_1 = 2.0$ (middle) and for $\epsilon_1 = 2.5$ (bottom).	68
Figure 37. Relationship between the incidence angle ( $\theta_i$ ) and the null spacing ( $\Delta f$ ) for $\epsilon_1 = 3.0$ (top), for $\epsilon_1 = 3.5$ (middle) and for $\epsilon_1 = 4.0$ (bottom).	69
Figure 38. The bistatic radar test setup with two linearly polarized antennas suspended over a dry sandbox.	71
Figure 39. Details on the geometry and design of the antenna mount.	72
Figure 40. Side view of the laboratory apparatus with the sandbox.	75
Figure 41. Close up of an antenna showing the mount and the placement of the Bosch GLM 80 Laser Distance and Angle Measurer.	76
Figure 42. Reflected power with an aluminum plate located at the base of the sandbox.	77
Figure 43. Reflected power with concrete paving blocks located at the base of the sandbox.	78
Figure 44. Laboratory measurements of the reflected power with $d_1 = 5, 10, 15,$ and $20$ cm of sand on top of an aluminum plate.	80
Figure 45. Laboratory measurements of the reflected power with $d_1 = 9.25, 9.50, 9.75$ and $10.00$ cm of sand on top of an aluminum plate. The specific angles indicated denote the location of the measured maximum.	81
Figure 46. Laboratory measurements of the reflected power with $d_1 = 9$ to $10$ cm, with a $0.25$ cm step size, sand on top of an aluminum plate.	82
Figure 47. A close up of the differences between a sand depth of $9$ and $10$ cm.	83
Figure 48. Interference pattern for $8-10$ cm of sand above a metal plate, with the antenna pointing at nadir ( $\theta_i = 0^\circ$ ).	85
Figure 49. Interference pattern for $10$ cm of sand above a metal plate, with the antenna pointing at nadir ( $\theta_i = 0^\circ$ ).	86
Figure 50. The null spacing ( $\Delta f$ ) as a function of the sand depth ( $d_1$ ) from $6.25$ to $20$ cm.	87

Figure 51. Interference pattern for 10 cm of sand above a metal plate, with the antennas pointing at various angles between 40° and 65°.	88
Figure 52. The null spacing ( $\Delta f$ ) as a function of the incidence angle ( $\theta_i$ ) for $d_1 = 10, 15,$ and $20$ cm.	89
Figure 53. Examples of rough and periodic surfaces tested in the lab (Left) ripples with a 3 cm peak to peak width and 1 cm in depth, (Middle) ripples with a 12 cm peak to peak width and 3 cm deep, (Right) evenly distributed rocks with a density of $\sim 100$ rocks/m <sup>2</sup> .	90
Figure 54. Interference pattern resulting from smooth sand (top), sand with rocks scattered on the surface (middle), and sand with rocks embedded in the first layer (bottom).	91
Figure 55. Orientation of the ripple aligned in two different vectors.	92
Figure 56. Interference pattern resulting from smooth sand (top) and periodic ripples of different sizes and orientations.	93
Figure 57. Comparison of the null spacing ( $\Delta f$ ) for smooth surface, with rocks scattered on the surface, with rocks embedded in the sand, and with periodic ripples (perpendicular).	94
Figure 58. Opportunity Rover EDL Sequence reproduced from Taylor et al., 2005.	98
Figure 59. Opportunity Rover orientation after landing.	98
Figure 60. Opportunity Rover X-band carrier received power during Opportunity's EDL.	99
Figure 61. Relationship between the null spacing ( $\Delta \theta_i$ ) and antenna height ( $h$ ) derived from the model.	100
Figure 62. Relationship between the null magnitude ( $\Delta P$ ) and relative permittivity of the soil derived from the model.	101
Figure 63. An improved estimate of the antenna height (black) with the knowledge that the relative permittivity of the soil is $\epsilon_1 = 3.3$ .	102
Figure 64. Opportunity Rover X-band carrier power as a function of incidence angle (black) and model fit (yellow).	103
Figure 65. Reflected signal power received by MSL HGA with no pointing restrictions.	104
Figure 66. Reflected signal power received by MSL HGA with a hard stop at $-35^\circ$ .	105
Figure 67. Reflected signal power received by MSL HGA from various one-layer soil models with different relative permittivities.	106

Figure 68. Reflected signal power received by MSL HGA from various two-layer soil models with different soil depths. 107

Figure 69. Relationship between the null spacing and layer depth derived from the model for the MSL HGA. 108

## List of Acronyms

AU	Astronomical unit, 149 597 870 700 m
CAD	Computer Aided Design
DSN	Deep Space Network
DSS	Deep Space Station
DTE	Direct to Earth
EDL	Entry, Descent and Landing
EM	Electromagnetic
ESA	European Space Agency
GDSCC	Goldstone Deep Space Communications Complex
GNSS	Global Navigation Satellite Systems
GNSS-R	Global Navigation Satellite Systems Reflectometry
GPR	Ground Penetrating Radar
H-pol	Horizontal Polarization
HGA	High Gain Antenna
JPL	Jet Propulsion Laboratory
Ka-band	Region of the EM spectrum from 26.5 – 40.0 GHz
Ku-band	Region of the EM spectrum from 12.0 – 18.0 GHz
L-band	Region of the EM spectrum from 1.0 – 2.0 GHz
LGA	Low Gain Antenna
LHCP	Left Hand Circular Polarization
LIDAR	Light Detection and Ranging

LTST	Local true solar time
MARRSI	Mars Radar and Radiometry Subsurface Investigation
MARSIS	Mars Advanced Radar for Subsurface and Ionosphere Sounding
MER	Mars Exploration Rover
MGA	Medium Gain Antenna
MGS	Mars Global Surveyor
MRO	Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter
MSL	Mars Science Laboratory
MY	Martian year, starting from the northern Spring equinox of April 11, 1955
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
PDS	Planetary Data System
ppb	Parts per billion
ppm	Parts per million
ppt	Parts per thousand
pr- $\mu\text{m}$	Precipitable micrometer
PWC	Precipitable water content
RADAR	Radio Detecting and Ranging
RH	Relative humidity
RHCP	Right Hand Circular Polarization
RIMFAX	Radar Imager for Mars Subsurface Experiment
RSL	Recurring Slope Lineae
SHARAD	Shallow Radar sounder aboard the Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter
SDST	Small Deep Space Transponder
Sol	Martian solar day

STK	Satellite or Systems Tool Kit
UTC	Coordinated Universal Time
UHF	Ultra High Frequency, Region of the EM spectrum from 300 MHz – 3.0 GHz
VHF	Very High Frequency, Region of the EM spectrum from 30 MHz – 300 MHz
V-pol	Vertical Polarization
X-band	Region of the EM spectrum from 8.0 – 12.0 GHz

## **Abstract**

Global Navigation Satellite Systems Reflectometry (GNSS-R) has shown that multipath interference signals offer an opportunity for passive devices to make measurements of the soil moisture, snow pack depth, and other quantities of scientific interest here on Earth. We expand upon this technique and propose that X-band microwave telecom signals can similarly be used to infer the sub-surface dielectric profile of the Earth, Mars, and other planetary bodies. The dielectric profile may reveal changes in the soil water content, the depth of a layer of sand, thickness of a layer of ice, and identify a subsurface layer of brine. We have created a numerical ray-tracing model to understand the potential of different microwave frequencies to probe the subsurface, to understand the trade between different polarizations, and to understand the sensitivity to changes in incidence angle and surface roughness features. This model has been validated through laboratory experiments using controlled layered beds of sand and bedrock. And finally, the model is used to extrapolate how this technique may be applied to future Mars missions.

Here we present new results demonstrating how to characterize a multipath interference pattern as a function of frequency and/or incidence angle to measure the thickness of a dielectric layer of sand or ice. Our results demonstrate that dielectric discontinuities in the subsurface can



be measured using X-band bistatic radar to effectively measure the thickness of a dielectric layer in the proximity of a landed spacecraft. In the case of an orbiter, we believe this technique would be effective at measuring the seasonal thickness of CO<sub>2</sub> ice in the polar regions and potentially identify the presence of brines underneath that ice. This is exciting because our method can produce results similar to traditional ground penetrating radar without the need to have an active radar transmitter onboard the spacecraft. It is possible that future telecommunications systems can serve as both a radio and a scientific instrument, thereby reducing the mass and power required for future interplanetary missions.