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The first experimental prototype (model-1) visioceilometer has been developed. It measures cloud height from 50 to 3000 meters with 10-meter accuracy and calculates visibility from a sample volume up to 1 kilometer in length of the lidar return. It consists of a hand-held, battery-operated lidar which uses the AN/GVS-5 laser rangefinder optics. Measurements of visibility in fog and cloud ceiling height in clear air and rain were taken at the fog dispersion test facility at Otis Air Force Base (AFB), MA. In relatively homogeneous fogs,
20. ABSTRACT (cont)

The visibility accuracy was comparable to standard transmissometers. The cloud ceiling accuracy was also comparable to the standard rotating beam ceilometer, (RBC).
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INTRODUCTION

The importance of visibility to the Field Army has long been recognized. Electro-optic based weapon systems such as Copperhead have ceiling and visibility requirements, but accurate measurements are often difficult. Standard airport visibility measuring transmissometers are bulky, heavy, and are bistatic devices. The difficulty of making measurements in this manner for slant visual range is apparent. It is not always possible to place devices at both ends of a meaningful path even for horizontal measurements. Lidars, or laser radars, offer a potential solution to the problem of measuring visibility since they are monostatic devices which can probe the atmosphere from one location. Recent advances in technology enable the size of lidars to be reduced from large research devices to instruments not much larger than a pair of binoculars.

In November 1975, tests were conducted at Randolph AFB, San Antonio, Texas, to evaluate the performance of the AN/GVS-5 laser rangefinder as a portable, hand-held battery-operated cloud height indicator. The laser rangefinder measurements compared to those of the RBC for 63 hourly samples from 28 November to 15 December 1975 produced a calculated linear least squares correlation coefficient of 0.77. A recommendation was then made to produce a combined hand portable ceiling and visibility sensor in one package. With this in mind, a joint development effort was initiated with the Laser Division of the Night Vision and Electro-Optics Laboratory at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, to add visibility measuring capability to the rangefinder. The result of this joint development and the subject of this report are the model-1 visioceilometer and its evaluation at the Otis AFB Fog Dispersion Test Facility.

VISIBILITY DEFINITION

Visibility as observed by the human eye is a very complex parameter depending on many factors other than the obscuring medium. Before any use can be made of a given measurement of visibility, it is important to select a definition which can be related to a variety of instruments as well as the human eye. For example, a standard airport transmissometer is said to measure visibility, but in actuality it measures transmission between two points. Under the same conditions it will indicate the same visibility at day or night even though the human eye might define the visibility as quite different. Nevertheless, the transmissometer measurement of visibility can

---

1R. S. Bonner and R. Newton, 1977, "Application of the AN/GVS-5 Laser Rangefinder to Cloud Base Height Measurements," ECOM-5812, Atmospheric Sciences Laboratory, White Sands Missile Range, NM

be related to how far the eye can discern a standard target in daylight or how distant a given light may be seen at night. Middleton\(^3\) has defined the meteorological range or visual range \(V_r\) to be

\[
V_r = -\ln(0.02) / \sigma ,
\]

where \(0.02\) is a minimum contrast threshold for standard target detection by eye and \(\sigma\) is the extinction coefficient per meter.

The contrast threshold has been accepted by the World Meteorological Organization and the US Air Force Air Weather Service for measurements in fog as \(0.05\) which yields a visual range of

\[
V_r = -\ln(0.05) / \sigma .
\]

For the purpose of this report, the visibility will be defined to be the visual range as defined in equation (2) whether observed by the human eye or measured by an instrument.

**VISIBILITY CALCULATION**

As the light from a lidar passes through an obscuring medium, the light is both scattered and absorbed. The formula governing the energy received by the lidar receiver is given by the lidar equation

\[
P_r(r) = P_t K \frac{c t}{2} \frac{A_r}{r^2} \beta(r) t_c(r) \exp \left[ -2 \int_0^r \sigma(r) dr \right],
\]

where

- \(P_r(r)\) = power collected (from a given range \(r\))
- \(K\) = lidar-system efficiency
- \(r\) = range
- \(P_t\) = power transmitted
- \(c\) = velocity of light
- \(t\) = pulse duration
- \(A_r\) = receiver area

\( \beta(r) = \text{backscatter coefficient (m}^{-1}\text{)} \)
\( t_c(r) = \text{beam convergence factor} \)
\( \sigma(r) = \text{volume extinction coefficient} \)

For the purpose of analysis, all of the constants and known functions can be combined to reduce the form of the equation to:

\[
P_r(r) = \frac{\xi \beta(r)}{r^2} e^{-2 \overline{\sigma}_r r}, \text{ where } \overline{\sigma}_r = \frac{\int_0^r \sigma(r) \, dr}{r}
\]

and \( \xi \) is the combination of constants and known functions. In this simplified formula, the energy returned to the receiver from a range \( r \) is proportional to the backscatter coefficient \( \beta(r) \) at \( r \) and inversely proportional to \( r^2 \).

At this point one has an exact equation with two unknowns which cannot be solved without further knowledge or assumption. If the transmissivity is measured, then \( \overline{\sigma}_r \) would be known, but this requires a double ended device and negates the purpose of using a lidar. Assuming that only the single lidar return is known, then the simplest course is to assume a homogeneous atmosphere.

Following Viezee, the term \( S(r) \) is defined:

\[
S(r) = 10 \log_{10} \frac{P_r(r) r^2}{P_r(r_0) r_0^2}, 
\]

where \( r_0 \) is a reference range and is constant. The derivative of \( S(r) \) over the range of full beam crossover is then:

\[
\frac{dS}{dr} = 4.34 \frac{1}{\beta(r)} \frac{d\beta(r)}{dr} - 8.7 \sigma(r). 
\]

---

When the backscatter coefficient $\beta(r)$ is independent of range as in the homogeneous scattering medium

$$\bar{\sigma}_r = \frac{-1}{8\pi} \frac{S}{r} = m = \text{slope}. \quad (7)$$

Then $\bar{\sigma}_r$ is the slope of the plot of $S(r)$ versus $r$ and is obtainable directly from the lidar returns. Viezee et al.\(^5\) have used this relation when $\frac{dS}{dr} < 0$. A more complete discussion of the errors and limitations on the technique is found in Viezee.\(^6\)

To determine an accurate value of $\bar{\sigma}_r$, a least squares linear fit is made to the $S(r)$ line to minimize the errors due to random noise and small inhomogeneities. The closeness of the fit also indicates how valid the homogeneity assumption is. This technique is readily adapted to computer analysis and was used to process the Otis AFB lidar returns for comparison to other visibility instrumentation.

**MULTIPLE SCATTERING**

In the preceding analysis, the assumption was made that the lidar return was composed solely of singly scattered photons. In very dense fogs this may not be the case. The parameters used in a study\(^7\) performed to determine the effects of multiple scatter in fogs on the model-1 visiometer are shown below:

- **Wavelength**: 1.06\(\mu\)m
- **Energy**: 10 mj
- **Pulse length**: 6 ns
- **Source size**: 0.8 cm
- **Beam 1/2 angle**: 0.5 mr
- **Receiver size**: 2.857 cm
- **Receiver 1/2 angle**: 1.5 mr
- **Source-receiver separation**: 12.065 cm


\(^7\)W. G. M. Blattner and C. M. Lampley, 1977, "Multiple Scattering Effects for Backscatter Lidar System at WSMR," Radiation Research Associates, RRA-47706, Fort Worth, TX
Figure 1 shows the effects of multiple scatter in fog on the visioceilometer receiver for a visibility of 100 meters. The three histograms are statistically derived results of multiple scattering calculations for single scattering, double scattering, and triple scattering. The smooth curve is calculated from the lidar equation by using the theoretical extinction and backscatter coefficients used in the multiple scatter calculations. Both the total and single scattering histograms agree well with the lidar equation with the exception of the early returns which are much larger than predicted by the lidar equation. Since multiple scattering is most important for low visibilities, figure 1 indicates the relative importance of multiple scattering.

The important result to visibility calculations is the conclusion that multiple scattering will only affect the slope technique slightly for low visibilities. In the 100- to 300-meter range for some fog models, the error in a least squares fit will be in the range of 5 to 10 percent. An important practical consideration is that both the peak height and the time of the peak of the lidar return are very different from the singly scattered return. The early returns are much larger than those predicted by the lidar equation, and these signals may overload the detector of the lidar and cause the later returns to be useless.

POTENTIAL USES

The model-1 visioceilometer (figures 2 and 3) is quite different from research lidars in that it contains a complete transient recorder and processing electronics in less than 1 cubic foot. It is designed to be completely automatic after the laser is fired and can be used with a minimum of training. It can be used in lieu of observer estimates of prevailing visibility at any weather observation station such as those of the Air Weather Service, Federal Aviation Agency, National Weather Service, and Navy. It can be used at remote airfields where cloud height and visibility measurements are required but where standard instruments are too inconvenient. An applied tactical use for this type of instrument would be at Army Division Artillery meteorological sections in lieu of visual observations and ceiling balloons. At present, the Navy has no accurate means of determining visibility or cloud height from its ships at sea. This device could provide a convenient means of making these measurements.

DEVICE DESCRIPTION

The model-1 visioceilometer uses the hand-held, battery-operated AN/GVS-5 laser rangefinder as a laser source for the ceiling and visibility detector. The laser emits a single 1.06-micrometer pulse averaging 10 millijoules in 6 nanoseconds. The backscattered atmospheric return produced by the interaction of the atmosphere and the laser pulse is detected in a 1.06-micrometer filtered photoavalanche detector which is temperature compensated for constant gain. Lidar returns from up to 3 kilometers are compressed by a
video logarithmic amplifier from four decades of input to two decades of output with 35 megahertz bandwidth. The compressed return is digitized to 12 bits by a 20-megahertz sampling rate transient recorder which has 455 sample points. The digitized return is fed serially into a mini-computer which calculates visibility or cloud ceiling height (figure 4).

TRANSIENT RECORDER

The heart of the visioceilometer is its transient recorder. The ability to capture a single lidar pulse return and digitize it for conversion to visibility is unique in a hand portable device. To do this, a charge coupled device (CCD) was chosen to slow the lidar return down to a rate at which a low power analog to digital converter (ADC) could digitize the return. The CCD allows the lidar return to be sampled at up to 20 megahertz and fed out at 44 kilohertz to the ADC. The 20-megahertz sample rate corresponds to a sample every 7.5 meters on the lidar return, and 44 kilohertz corresponds to a reliable digitization rate in a 12 bit ADC.

Functionally, the CCD is a sequence of sample and hold circuits which pass the sample input from the input to the next sample and hold as packets of charge. For this reason, the CCD is sometimes referred to as a "bucket brigade." The main advantage of the CCD is its extremely fast acquisition time. In many cases it is limited only by the clock shift transition time which may be as small as a few nanoseconds. The main disadvantage of CCD is that the signals decay through leakage of charge in the registers. At temperatures above 23° Celsius the signal may decay away before it shifts out of the CCD. This thermal decay is displayed as a gradual decreasing baseline on the return signal plot (figures 5 and 9).

The CCD thermal decay can be separated from the lidar return, however, by a curve fit to the points beyond where the signal-to-noise ratio becomes one. The fit is a polynomial of the form $P_r(r) = a + br + cr^2$ where $a$, $b$, and $c$ are constants. A fit is made to every lidar return from sample 80 to sample 100, and the result is extrapolated over the entire curve to remove thermal decay.

In like manner, the system nonlinearities are removed by a polynomial fit to a calibration curve. The calibration curve was obtained by measuring the digital values produced by test voltages (figure 5). Figure 6 shows the resulting calibration curve generated by making a ninth degree least squares polynomial fit to the log of the digital output versus the voltage input. Each sample point of the lidar return must be calculated through the ninth degree polynomial to obtain the actual lidar return independent of circuit nonlinearities. Both the calibration curve and decay curve fitting introduce unnecessary programming complications which will be eliminated in the second experimental prototype visioceilometer (model-2).
ANCILLARY DATA SYSTEMS

To properly evaluate the model-I visioceilometer and gain a data base on which to build improved visibility algorithms, a ceiling and visibility evaluation system (CAVES) was constructed in a 32-foot van. The CAVES consists of a Nova 3 minicomputer for data gathering and interfaces to various visibility and meteorological instruments. The main purpose of the Nova 3, however, is to automatically fire the visioceilometer, store its lidar returns, and convert the returns to visibility. Real-time plots of the lidar data also ensure the validity of the data.

EXPERIMENT DESCRIPTION

In May 1978 an experiment was conducted at Otis AFB, MA, to compare the performance of the model-I visioceilometer to that of a 152-meter path transmissometer\(^8\) and to that of the EG&G forward scatter meter (FSM)\(^9,10\) for visibility determinations. In addition, cloud height measurement comparisons were made between the visioceilometer, the AN/GVS-5 laser rangefinder, and the AN/GMQ-13A RBC. Figure 7 shows a top view of the relative positions of the instruments. The beam path of the visioceilometer, separated horizontally by approximately 6 meters and vertically by approximately 2 meters. The EG&G FSM was located midway on the length of the path of the transmissometer, separated horizontally from the transmissometer path by 1 meter, and at the same height above the ground as the transmissometer. For cloud height measurements, the visioceilometer was removed from the top of the Atmospheric Sciences Laboratory (ASL) van and placed 1 meter horizontally from the RBC receiver and at the same level above the ground (figure 8).

The Naval Research Laboratory (NRL) provided several Knollenberg particulate counters and transmissometers with their own instrumented van\(^10\) which was located approximately 7.5 meters from the ASL van. The size distributions from these particle counters can be used with Mie theory to calculate a theoretical extinction and backscatter coefficient against which the transmissometers and lidars can be compared. Even more important is the data base for comparisons from which improved future designs of lidars can benefit.

---


On 17 May 1978 data were collected during the period 0651 to 0726 local time from the visibility instruments described in the experiment description. This fog was at least 60 meters thick at 0651 because forward scatter meters mounted at 61 meters on towers near the experiment were indicating 0.15 kilometer visibility. The visibility decreased at the 61-meter level until the end of the sampling period where it was 0.09 kilometer. Winds were 1 to 2 miles per hour for the entire sampling period over the entire vertical interval from 3 to 61 meters.

Wind data were recorded on 17 May 1978 from an instrument located within 10 meters of a line between the transmissometer projector and detector and halfway between them. The anemometer was approximately 3 meters above the surface. The data are shown in table 1.

TABLE 1. WINDS DURING FOG VISIBILITY COMPARISON MEASUREMENTS
17 May 1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Dir</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Dir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0651</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>0709</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0652</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>0710</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0653</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>0711</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0654</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0712</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0655</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>0713</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0656</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>0714</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0657</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>0715</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0658</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>0716</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0659</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0717</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0700</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>0718</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0701</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>0719</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0702</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0720</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0703</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0721</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0704</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>0722</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0705</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>0723</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0706</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>0724</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0707</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>0725</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0708</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>0726</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On 24 May 1978 cloud height data were taken with the visioceilometer, the AN/GVS-5 laser rangefinder, and the RBC during the time interval 1724 to 1757. The data from the RBC were transmitted to an oscilloscope whose trace was recorded on video tape. In this manner a permanent record was made of each sampling of the cloud base by the RBC. The video tapes were later scanned for the RBC data and were reduced manually. Data from the AN/GVS-5 were recorded manually by observing the display in the eyepiece of the instrument and recording it on paper. The visioceilometer data were automatically stored in the computer system for later reduction.

RESULTS

Cloud Ceiling Measurements

By using the experimental setup described in figure 8, a comparison was made on 24 May 1978 at Otis AFB between several standard cloud height indicators and the model-I visioceilometer. The RBC is used at many airports and is the standard against which these comparisons were made. The ASEA type QL-1210 ceilometer is a multiple pulse lidar for use up to 1000 meters with chart recorder output. The AN/GVS-5 rangefinder is a single pulse lidar for use in ranging solid targets from 100 meters to 10 kilometers. Its application to cloud measurements has been discussed in an earlier report.1

Several visioceilometer lidar returns from hard targets are shown in figure 9. In every case the range to targets agreed to within 10 meters with the AN/GVS-5 laser rangefinder which was previously calibrated against measured distance targets and was as accurate as the measured distances. The dropout occurring from points 62 to 64 is caused by an internal fault in the CCD chip which is eliminated in processed data by the minicomputer. The slope of the lidar return is a combination of CCD decay and visibility attenuation. In visibility data, the CCD decay is eliminated by a second degree curve fitting to the tail of the return. In cloud height or target data, there is no need for this processing, so raw data curves are presented.


1R. S. Bonner and R. Newton, 1977, "Application of the AN/GVS-5 Laser Rangefinder to Cloud Base Height Measurements," ECOM-5812, Atmospheric Sciences Laboratory, White Sands Missile Range, NM
Figures 10 and 11 are typical stratus cloud returns as measured by the visioceilometer in light to moderate rain. In figure 10, there is little or no rain striking the ground in the area around the lidars, but in figure 11 there is light to moderate rainfall near the ground. This is shown by the series of sharp spikes in the return below 155 meters.

The visioceilometer could distinguish easily between rain and clouds by its reaction to the rain (small width pulses) and its reaction to the cloud base (wide pulse). However, the AN/GVS-5 laser rangefinder erroneously indicated the distance to the rain since it contains simple discriminator circuits which look for a threshold. Three types of errors were observed with the rangefinders:

1. Low range indications due to rain.
2. No range indication due to weak return or below minimum range capability signal.
3. High range indication due to signal attenuation and cloud penetration.

These errors may cause the indicated cloud height to be in error by a factor of two to three. A comparison of the cloud heights as measured by the RBC and the AN/GVS-5 laser rangefinder is shown in figure 12. Zero values indicate no return or below minimum range after repeated laser firings.

The RBC can also distinguish between rain and clouds, but a human interpretation is required which may vary greatly between observers. Nevertheless, the visioceilometer followed the RBC trace to within 120 meters maximum and 0 meters minimum separation as can be seen in figure 13 which is the same block of data as figure 12. No data were taken during the period between 1704 and 1720 minutes on the RBC. Most of the disagreement originated in uncertainties in human interpretation of the RBC display, and the visioceilometer is believed to be accurate to ±10 meters for cloud ceilings.

Visibility Measurements

An example of the slope analysis of a single lidar return is shown in the processed lidar return of figure 14. The initial rise of the lidar signal is caused by the gradual overlap of the transmitter and receiver fields of view. The lidar return is set equal to zero at point 40 where the signal-to-noise ratio becomes one due to a detector threshold noise problem. A linear least squares fit is shown superimposed on the return, which is essentially what is shown in equation (5). The slope of the fitted line is inversely proportional to the visibility. Note that the steeper the fitted line, the lower the visibility. A nearly horizontal fitted line corresponds to clear air visibility. If the slope of the line is positive, the fog is increasing in
density quickly and the slope technique will not work. The extremely close fit of the return to a straight line indicates that this fog sample is very homogeneous and the assumptions are valid for the slope fit.

Figure 15 shows a plot of the visibility obtained during an episode of fog at the Otis AFB fog dispersion facility. The three lines correspond to visibility as calculated from the visioceilometer, a 152-meter path length transmissometer (AN/GMQ-10), and the EG&G forward scatter meter. The dashed line indicates periods when no data were taken on one or more of the comparison instruments.

The forward scatter meter has a time constant of 50 seconds on the output, and the transmissometer has a time constant of 10 seconds. This reduces the actual variability of the fog by averaging out the fluctuations. The visioceilometer, however, makes its measurement in about 5 microseconds and records a virtually instantaneous value of the visibility. For this reason, the visioceilometer shows more variability with time than the range instruments. This characteristic of the visioceilometer is more realistic in displaying the spatial and temporal variability of the fogs than the long time averaged devices.

FUTURE PLANS

The model-1 visioceilometer is presently being updated with a new CCD circuit. The new CCD circuit will not contain the dropout at points 62 to 64 and will be operated in a differential mode to eliminate the thermal decay problem. The transient recorder power will also be strobed to prolong battery life in the updated model-1.

An engineering design analysis has recently been concluded to determine the best design for an improved model-2 visioceilometer. The current model-1 prototype weighs 16 pounds and measures 12 inches long by 11-1/2 inches wide by 7 inches high. The new model-2 visioceilometer should be both smaller and lighter and have less power consumption. In addition, the model-2 will be in two packages connected by a cable (figure 16). The optical unit will be housed in an AN/GVS-5 case and weigh about 5 pounds. The transient recorder and microprocessor will be reused in a separate case about the same size as the AN/GVS-5 and weigh less than 6 pounds. These study estimates of the weight are expected to be reduced quite significantly in the final visioceilometer.

Improved algorithms for visibility inversions based on the Otis AFB test data have been developed and will be installed in the model-2 visioceilometer. They are currently operational in the CAVES minicomputer and will be used with the improved model-1 visioceilometer to gather further data for future refinements.
Figure 1. Receiver response for a visibility of 100 m.
Figure 2. Operator view of model-1 visioceilometer.
Figure 3. Optics side of model-1 visoceilometer.
Figure 4. Block diagram of model-1 visoceilometer connected to minicomputer system.

Figure 5. Response to input pulse with thermal decay (sloped baseline).
Figure 6. Calibration curve for model-1 visioceilometer.

OTIS A.F.B. EXPERIMENT CONFIGURATION (TOP VIEW)

Figure 7. Otis AFB experiment configuration.
Figure 8. Experiment configuration for taking cloud height data at Otis AFB.

Figure 9. Visioceilometer returns from hard targets.
Figure 10. Visioceilometer cloud height return with indication of rain immediately below the cloud.

Figure 11. Visioceilometer cloud height return with rain immediately above the sensor.
Figure 12. Comparison of the AN/GVS-5 to the RBC.
Figure 13. Comparison of the visioceilometer to the RBC.
Figure 14. Linear least squares fit to backscatter return.

Figure 15. Visibility measurement comparisons of the visiocceilometer, forward scatter meter, and transmissometer.
Figure 16. Portable visioceilometer (model-2).
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