Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 3, 4231–4260, 2010 www.atmos-meas-tech-discuss.net/3/4231/2010/ doi:10.5194/amtd-3-4231-2010 © Author(s) 2010. CC Attribution 3.0 License.



This discussion paper is/has been under review for the journal Atmospheric Measurement Techniques (AMT). Please refer to the corresponding final paper in AMT if available.

A novel technique for extracting clouds base height using ground based imaging

E. Hirsch¹, E. Agassi², and I. Koren¹

¹Department of Environmental Sciences, Weizmann Institute, Rehovot, 76100, Israel ²Department of Environmental Physics, Israel Institute for Biological Research, Nes-Ziona, Israel

Received: 13 September 2010 – Accepted: 24 September 2010 – Published: 4 October 2010

Correspondence to: E. Hirsch (eitan.hirsch@weizmann.ac.il)

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.



Abstract

The height of a cloud in the atmospheric column is a key parameter in its characterization. Several remote sensing techniques (passive and active, either ground-based or on space-borne platforms) and in-situ measurements are routinely used in order to ⁵ estimate top and base heights of clouds. In this article we present a novel method that combines thermal imaging from the ground and sounded wind profile in order to derive the cloud base height. This method is independent of cloud types, making it efficient for both low boundary layer and high clouds. In addition, using thermal imaging ensures extraction of clouds' features during daytime as well as at nighttime. The proposed technique was validated by comparison to active sounding by ceilometers (which is a standard ground based method), to lifted condensation level (LCL) calculations, and to

- MODIS products obtained from space. As all passive remote sensing techniques, the proposed method extracts only the height of the lowest cloud layer, thus upper cloud layers are not detected. Nevertheless, the information derived from this method can be
- ¹⁵ complementary to space-borne cloud top measurements when deep-convective clouds are present. Unlike techniques such as LCL, this method is not limited to boundary layer clouds, and can extract the cloud base height at any level, as long as sufficient thermal contrast exists between the radiative temperatures of the cloud and its surrounding air parcel. Another advantage of the proposed method is its simplicity and
- ²⁰ modest power needs, making it particularly suitable for field measurements and deployment at remote locations. Our method can be further simplified for use with visible CCD or CMOS camera (although nighttime clouds will not be observed).

1 Introduction

Parameterization of cloud fields in the atmosphere has crucial importance for at-²⁵ mospheric science (Kiehl and Trenberth, 1997) and aviation safety (Schafer et al., 2004) applications. Remote cloud sensing techniques can be characterized by the



observation point – space or ground based measurements, and by the sensing method – either active (cloud/rain radar, LIDAR) or passive. In addition, cloud boundaries can be retrieved by in-situ measurements of the atmospheric profile with radiosonde. The overall cloud effects on the atmosphere and on the Earth's radiative budget depend on

- ⁵ cloud height, thickness, and its radiative properties (IPCC, 2007). Since complex feedbacks are involved, the presence of a cloud layer can either cool the atmosphere and surface below it by absorption and reflection of the incoming shortwave solar flux, or warm it by absorption and emission of ground emitted long-wave radiation (Kiehl and Trenberth, 1997). As a result, shallow clouds which usually reflect significant amount
- ¹⁰ of the received solar irradiance, have only a minor effect on the total thermal radiation emitted by the Earth, since the magnitude of their emitted radiation is comparable with a cloud free surface. On the other hand, high clouds, such as anvils (Koren et al., 2010) or cirrus, may have relatively low reflectance in the visible portion of the spectrum, and might noticeably cause warming of the atmosphere.
- Profile-based cloud boundary retrieval techniques, such as LCL (Wang and Rossow, 1995; Chernykh and Eskridge, 1996), usually calculate the height at which an air parcel would reach saturation when lifted and cooled adiabatically. These techniques are considered reliable for convective clouds in well mixed boundary layers, but are less suitable for clouds forming above rugged terrain (Craven et al., 2002) and not suitable
 for clouds outside the boundary layer (Naud et al., 2003).

Active sensing from space provides information regarding geometric, radiative and microphysical properties of clouds. These products are based on analyzing the backscatter signal of either LIDARs (e.g, CALIPSO; Winker et al., 2003) or Radars (CloudSat and TRMM for example; see Stephens et al., 2002; Kummerow et al., 1998).

Regarding clouds vertical extent, active sensing from space enables the extraction of the top and frequently the base heights of clouds (unless very thick, convective clouds are present). Space-borne passive sounding, on the other hand, enables retrieval solely of cloud top heights (Platnick et al., 2003), by using multiple pairs of ratios of the measured radiance within two wavelengths in the vicinity of CO₂ absorption bands.



Active ground observations of clouds are routinely carried out for aviation safety. The required information in this application is usually cloud layer base heights and fractional coverage of the sky hemisphere. A common and widely used technique is analysis of the backscatter signal of a laser beam transmitted vertically from the ground (Pal et al.,

- ⁵ 1992). This technique is considered reliable and usually provides the vertical extent of the clouds as well, although the commercial instruments for this purpose (ceilometers) are usually limited by range (typically, up to 7 km) due to energy constraints of the transmitter. Active sensing from the ground can be also used for retrieval of radiative and microphysical properties of clouds as well (Chiu et al., 2007, for example).
- Passive ground observations for extraction of cloud features are rare, although it was shown that radiance rationing near an absorption band of CO₂ at 15 µm enables the extraction of cloud base heights using a FTIR interferometer (Mahesh et al., 2001). Passive ground based techniques are usually used for cloud coverage measurements with a wide angle lens and a simple CCD camera (such as the Total Sky Imager; Long
- et al., 2001). Although this method has great advantages over active sensing in terms of cost and flexibility, it cannot provide the cloud base height, furthermore strong solar radiation scattering complicates the cloud image analysis. Using CCD cameras has an additional disadvantage: natural illumination is needed to obtain a good sky image for analysis. Employing LWIR imagers instead of CCD cameras can eliminate the last two
- ²⁰ problems and offers high sensitivity due to the thermal contrast between the clear sky and the clouds. Therefore it is most likely that IR measurements of the sky will provide high contrast images even of sparse, thin clouds, throughout the day and night. Until several years ago, LWIR cameras were expensive, bulky, and required cooling. Significant progress has been achieved in the manufacturing of low-cost, reliable, uncooled
- small microbolometer arrays for thermal imaging. Nevertheless, we suspect the usage of this technology for cloud field monitoring will remain limited without a complementary method to retrieve cloud base height from the sky images.

In this article we introduce a simple method that enhances the utility of ground based thermal imaging, by combining the data with the atmospheric wind velocity profile,



enabling derivation of cloud base at any height regardless of their type or time of measurement. Unlike in space-borne remote sensing measurements, the contribution of the lower, usually hot and humid, atmospheric layers to the radiative temperature of a cloud is relatively large. Therefore, utilizing a method that is independent of the hu-

- ⁵ midity and temperature profile from the ground to the cloud is of great advantage. Moreover, there is no need for high accuracy calibration procedures, since the calibrated radiative temperature is not essential for the method's performance. This method can close important gaps in both space-borne and ground-based sounding of clouds. First, it can be used as a complementary analysis to space-borne remote sensing, especially
- where thick clouds are present, where their base heights cannot be assessed. Second, this method can be readily incorporated with CCD based sky imagers, which currently only analyze cloud coverage. This integration will result in a powerful measurement tool that will provide valuable data about cloud coverage and heights, all day and all year. Another advantage arises from the fact the proposed method does not require
- any preparations and is based on off-the-shelf equipment with modest power consumption, thus making it particularly suitable for a field measurement campaign or for operation at remote sites. The only required input is information about the atmospheric wind velocity profile, either measured by in-situ ground launched radio-sounding, or by future space-borne Doppler wind LIDAR (Tan and Andersson, 2005). Obviously, the
- ²⁰ proposed method assumes the wind profile input represents the wind field above the sensor. Since one of the parameters that determine the boundary layer height is the roughness of the surface (Deardorff, 1972), it is possible that utilizing this method in rugged terrain, and using wind profile retrieved by radiosonde, will cause some errors in the retrieval of low boundary layer clouds.
- In the next section the ensemble of our measurement equipment (mainly multispectral CCD and IR imager) is introduced as well as other data sources (local radiosounding and ceilometers data). A detailed description of the proposed method is presented in Sect. 3, followed by examples of the method performance in Sect. 4. We conclude the article by summary and discussion.



2 Data sources

5

10

15

2.1 On site measurement setup

An on-site measurement assembly of sensors was built in order to provide continuous multispectral imaging of cloud fields. The CLOUDS SPECTATOR (SPECtral spaTiAl TempOral Resolution) measurement assembly (Fig. 1) contains the following cameras:

- D1H (Nikon, USA): RGB (color), 1324 × 2012 pixels CCD. Field of view (FOV): $25^{\circ} \times 37^{\circ}$.
- SENSICAM (PCO, Germany): 1000 × 1000 pixels, thermo-electrically cooled EM-CCD with NIR filter (780–900 nm). FOV: 35° × 35°.
- A40 (FLIR SYSTEMS, USA): 240 × 320 pixels, microbolometer, calibrated to effective radiant temperature, uncooled IR (7–14 μm) imager. FOV: 18° × 24°.

These 3 sensors were mounted on a computerized pan and tilt head, which enables automatic measurement of cloud fields and clear sky in pre-configured tasks, at various geometrical setups (azimuth, elevation and relative angle between the observer and the sun).

The CLOUDS SPECTATOR operates on a roof of a 6 floor building, and it is in close proximity to NASA's AERONET (Holben et al., 1998) sun-photometer station (website: "AERONET Data Display – site: Nes_Ziona"). In addition to the SPECTATOR we conduct continuous measurements with a Net Radiometer (CNR1, Kipp & Zonen,

The Netherlands), which measures radiance of the sky hemisphere in the short-wave (305–2800 nm) and in the long-wave (5–50 μm) spectral ranges. Additionally, a meteorological station constantly monitors the wind velocity (USA-1, METEK, Germany), air temperature, and relative humidity (HMP45C, Campbell Scientific INC, USA). Throughout this article, the data was obtained by the SPECTATOR in a single measurement scheme: the sensors were horizontally turned northward using a digital pitch, roll, and



yaw meter (3DM, MicroStrain, USA). Afterwards, the SPECTATOR was set to an elevation angle of 90°, thus all clouds imaged by the cameras can be analyzed according to their direction on the compass rose. The sensors were set for continuous acquisition of sky images every 10 s for the IR and NIR cameras and every 60 s for the true-color camera. During the months of March–May, 2010, we acquired data of 54 diurnal cycles, under various environmental and cloudiness conditions: clear skies, low cumulus

2.2 External data sources

clouds fields, and high cirrus clouds.

Radio-sounding: our method uses the wind profile which is measured twice a day at
the Beit-Dagan meteorological station (website: "Atmospheric Sounding"). These measurements are conducted at 00:00 and 12:00 GMT, and provide information about the pressure, temperature, humidity, and wind velocity profile. The use of the sounding measurement serves two purposes: derivation of the cloud base height by comparing the sounded wind velocity with our calculated wind velocity (detailed below), and
validation of the cloud base height by calculating the lifted condensation level (Bolton, 1980).

Ceilometer: to validate our method's results for low cumulus clouds we use the hourly readings of the ceilometers stationed in the Ben-Gurion airport (website: "Station Observations"), which is located approximately 10 km from our measurement site.

²⁰ Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS): to validate our method's results for high cirrus clouds we use the MODIS product (website: "LAADS Web") for cloud top pressure. This product is less suitable than active space-borne platforms (such as CloudSat or CALIPSO), but more available due to MODIS's large field of view.



3 Extracting the clouds base heights from the measured data

As stated in the introduction, the proposed method combines analysis of ground based thermal imaging with an atmospheric wind profile in order to extract the base heights of passing clouds. As commonly practiced in remote sensing, we assume that, as a good approximation clouds move at the same speed as the ambient body of air (Kambhamettu et al., 1996; Leese et al., 1971).

Clouds form, dissipate and change continuously. In order to determine the cloud movement we use short time steps, assuming that most of the coherent differences between two sequential snapshots will be due to the cloud displacement. The cloud structure is compared for each pair of sequential snapshots, and we search for the best displacements by means of maximum correlation. As a first stage, we use the thermal images to calculate the angular velocity of the clouds. This goal is achieved by analysis of the regions in the image that pose high local contrast within a series of 20 successive thermal images (Fig. 2). These high contrast regions are tracked in the sequential image by finding the displacement which provides the maximal spatial correlation value. This procedure enables the extraction of the angular velocity of the cloud's regions, which are later used to calculate a representative angular value for the entire cloud. We use the following scheme:

- Every thermal image acquired at time *t*, Img^{*t*}, is transformed using the following mathematical operator:

$$\operatorname{Img} \mathcal{T}_{(i,j)}^{t} = \sigma(\operatorname{Img}_{((i-1)\times40+1:i\times40,(j-1)\times40+1:j\times40)}^{t})$$
(1)

Where $\sigma(\text{Img})$ is defined as the standard deviation of the radiative temperature values within the image Img. This process divides every image into blocks of 40×40 pixels. Each block is assigned with the value of the standard deviation of the radiative temperatures of the pixels that contribute to this block (Fig. 3). Thus the original 240 × 320 pixels images are transformed into 6 × 8 pixels images.



25

20

5

- Regions with high standard deviation values are indicators for areas with high spatial variability (usually cloud edges), which are good candidates for temporal tracking. Then, we select the top 48 blocks (5%), out of the 960 (6 × 8 × 20) blocks computed, with the highest standard deviation values as a selection criterion.
- Due to its high sensitivity to the object's shape, rather to its magnitude, we use spatial cross correlation (Jahne, 1997) to calculate the temporal displacement of these blocks: Let *R* be a 40 × 40 pixels block in the thermal image Img^{t} . The cross correlation matrix C_R of this block is calculated with every 40 × 40 region in the image Img^{t+1} :

$$\forall i, j : R_{(i,j)}^{t+1} = \operatorname{Img}^{t+1}(i : i + 39, j :$$

$$C_{R}(i,j) = \frac{1}{40 \times 40} \times < \frac{R - \bar{R}}{\sigma(R)} > \cdot < \frac{R_{(i,j)}^{t+1} - R_{(i,j)}^{t+1}}{\sigma\left(R_{(i,j)}^{t+1}\right)} >$$

If the maximal value of C_R exceeds an empirically predefined threshold, we consider its spatial coordinates (i_{\max}, j_{\max}) , as the horizontal displacement in the image plane $D_h = j_{\max} - j$ [pixels], and the vertical displacement $D_v = i_{\max} - i$ [pixels]. Typical results of this process are illustrated in Fig. 4.

 Since the time lag (Δt) between the images is constant, and the IFOV (Instantaneous Field Of View) of the camera is known, the angular speed of the block (that corresponds to the cloud edge angular speed) in terms of mrad/sec, is readily derived:

$$\omega_{\rm h}^R = \frac{D_{\rm h} \times \text{ifov}}{\Delta t}; \quad \omega_{\rm v}^R = \frac{D_{\rm v} \times \text{ifov}}{\Delta t}$$

(2)

(3)

(4)

20

15

10

- In order to eliminate extreme values which originate from local failure to find a correlative block (either because the cloud segment was spatially modified or because it was no longer present in the field of view), the obtained horizontal and vertical angular speeds of the clouds (ω_h, ω_v) are taken to be the median value of all calculated angular speeds.
- The planar angular speed is taken as the root of sum of squares of the horizontal and vertical angular speeds:

$$\omega = \sqrt{\omega_{\rm h}^2 + \omega_{\rm v}^2}$$

5

10

 As mentioned above, turning our sensors northward, prior to the image acquisition, ensures that the wind direction of the air layer in which the cloud propagates is simply derived from the horizontal and vertical planar angular speeds.

Since $V = h\omega$, where V is the tangential speed and h is the distance between the observer and the cloud layer (cloud base height), we can derive a possible planar wind speed profile (ranging from the camera up to 15 km) based on the calculated angular speed ω . This hypothesized profile is then compared to the radiosonde wind velocity profile measured in Beit-Dagan (website: "Atmospheric Sounding"). The heights h_p at which these two lines intersect are considered an estimate of clouds' base heights (Fig. 5). Further verification is achieved by comparing the wind direction values at the possible heights to the calculated wind direction (Fig. 6). If the sounded wind direction falls within $\pm 15^{\circ}$ of the calculated value, we consider the height $h_{D(i)}$ as a valid cloud 20 base height. Naturally, there is no guarantee for the utility of the proposed method, since it depends on the specific wind velocity profile. Therefore, ambiguous results are occasionally produced, as multiple heights are obtained. As in all retrieval techniques, the proposed analysis is subject to some possible measurement errors. We assume the error in deriving clouds motion is not higher than half a pixel in every dimension 25 (IFOV/2=0.65 mrad). Naturally, the tangential magnitude of this error depends on the



(5)

distance to the cloud as illustrated by the green error lines in Fig. 5. Another possible error might arise in determining the direction of the clouds movement, either from imperfect position of the SPECTATOR board with regard to the north, or from imperfect alignment of the IR camera within the body of the SPECTATOR itself. To encapsulate these errors we allow margins of $\pm 15^{\circ}$ in the wind direction retrieval.

4 Method performance

5

20

In this section we present examples of our method's capabilities in extracting clouds base heights of several different cloud types: low cumulus, free atmosphere and high cirrus clouds. As validation to the method's readings we will use several techniques: for 10 the low cumulus clouds we will compare to Ben-Gurion ceilometer (website: "Station Observations") and to LCL calculation (Bolton, 1980). For the free atmosphere clouds we will compare to the ceilometer reading, and as for the cirrus clouds, we will use the MODIS clouds top pressure product (website: "LAADS Web") since the ceilometer's maximum observation is at ~7.5 km.

15 4.1 Low cumulus clouds at daytime

Figures 7 and 8 present the analysis of thermal images that were acquired by the SPECTATOR on 4 March 2010 at 11:05 GMT. Intersecting wind speeds clearly indicate the cloud base is at 934 m (Fig. 7), corresponding to a high humidity layer. The estimated cloud base height is further verified by the wind direction analysis (Fig. 8); this indicates westerly wind of 280° according to our FOV analysis while the measured wind direction at this height is 282°, well within our predefined error margins. The mea-

sured height deviates 9.8% from the ceilometer reading (1036 m) and 5.9% from the LCL calculation (993 m).



4.2 High cirrus clouds at daytime

Figures 9 and 10 present the analysis of thermal images that were acquired by the SPECTATOR on 9 March 2010 at 11:25 GMT. Intersecting wind speeds indicate 2 possible cloud base heights: 3600 m and 10 020 m (Fig. 9), both corresponding to a high relative humidity layer. Using the wind direction profile, the lower layer is ruled out (Fig. 10), since the wind direction at this height is outside the wind direction limits. Therefore the only valid base height is 10 020 m as verified by the wind direction profile. Since high cirrus clouds exceed the range of ceilometers, we can validate our method only by using MODIS products (Fig. 11). The retrieved data indicates cloud top pressure of 210 hPa with a measurement error of ± 50 hPa (Platnick et al., 2003). Comparing these values to the atmospheric profile (Fig. 12) at the time of the measurement, we find that, according to MODIS, the cloud top height is in the range of 10 460–13 470 m.

4.3 Free atmosphere clouds at nighttime

- ¹⁵ Figure 13 presents the analysis of thermal images that were acquired by the SPEC-TATOR on 16 April 2010 at 00:50 GMT. Intersecting wind speeds indicates 4 possible cloud base heights: 950, 5310, 8350, and 10 300 m. Analyzing the wind direction rules out all possible heights but 5310 m, while according to the ceilometer sounding, at the time of the analysis the cloud base height was 5182 m (2.5% deviation).
- Figure 14 presents the analysis of thermal images that were acquired by the SPEC-TATOR on 27 April 2010 at 20:50 GMT. Intersecting wind speeds indicate 3 possible cloud base heights: 962, 1045, and 4720 m. Analyzing the wind direction rules out all possible heights but 4720 m, while according to the ceilometer sounding, at the time of the analysis the cloud base height was 4267 m (10.6% deviation).



5 Conclusions and discussion

We have presented a novel technique for deriving cloud base heights using thermal imaging from the ground combined with wind profile data. The method is based on calculating the angular velocity of the clouds and producing a hypothesized vertical wind

- ⁵ profile. This profile is compared with the true (sounded) wind profile in the atmosphere, in order to derive the possible cloud base height. The method's main drawback is its need for updated wind profile, which can be obtained either by nearby radiosonde or by wind LIDAR. Another disadvantage is the theoretical possibility of retrieving ambiguous results where multiple cloud base heights might be produced. In spite the above,
- ¹⁰ we have demonstrated the method's utility for low cumulus, free atmosphere, and high cirrus clouds, independent of cloud type or measurement hour. Our obtained results were validated by using active sounding from the ground, atmospheric thermodynamic calculations (LCL), and passive space borne sounding. Since it is common to refer to active ceilometers readings as the "true" cloud base height (Craven et al., 2002), we
- ¹⁵ suggest two possible explanations for the method's deviation from the ceilometer readings: (1) small spatial variations in the wind profile might result with different cloud base height. (2) The ceilometer reports the average value of all clouds passing over (usually within 0.5 h time period), while our method explores the height of a single cloud. The examples in the previous section demonstrate the method's efficiency in extracting
- clouds base height, with the usage of wind profile solely, while thermodynamic parameters such as LCL calculations are not relevant (clouds outside the boundary layer), or when standard ceilometers fail to detect them (high clouds). Further validation of this method should be made by quantitative performance analysis for different cloud types and measurement regions. Nevertheless, we believe this technique can be exploited
- as complementary analysis to space-borne passive remote sensing, or integrated with commercial whole sky imagers to analyze both the fractional cloud coverage and base height as well. The proposed method can expand the capability of cloud field sounding both in space and time. In addition, it might be particularly useful at field campaigns or



at remote locations due to its simplicity and low power consumption needs. The equipment needed for this method is simple and relatively inexpensive and can be further simplified by using a visible camera instead of a thermal imager (although nighttime clouds would then not be observable).

Acknowledgements. The authors are thankful to Amnon Sharon for his essential technical support in establishing and maintaining the measurement assembly. This research was supported by the Israel Science Foundation (grant 1172/10) and the Minerva Foundation (grant 780048).

References

1046-1053, 1980.

AERONET Data Display - site: Nes_Ziona: Available at: http://aeronet.gsfc.nasa.gov/cgi-bin/

- type_one_station_opera_v2_new?site=Nes_Ziona&nachal=2&level=3&place_code=10. last access: 17 May, 2010.
- Atmospheric Sounding: Available at: http://weather.uwyo.edu/upperair/sounding.html. last access: March–May, 2010.

Bolton, D.: The computation of equivalent potential temperature, Mon. Weather Rev., 108,

15

20

25

10

Chernykh, I. V. and Eskridge, R. E.: Determination of cloud amount and level from radiosonde sounding, J. Appl. Meteorol., 35, 1362–1369, 1996.

- Chiu, J. C., Marshak, A., Wiscombe, W. J., Valencia, S., and Welton, E. J.: Cloud optical depth retrievals from solar background signal of micropulse lidars, Geosci. Remote Sens. Lett., 43, 456–460, 2007.
- Craven, J. P., Jewell, R. E., and Brooks, H. E.: Comparison between observed convective cloud-base heights and lifting condesation level for two different lifted air parcels, Weather Forecast., 17, 885–890, 2002.

Deardorff, J. W.: Parameterization of the planetary boundary layer for use in general ciculation models, Mon. Weather Rev., 100, 93–106, 1972.

Gentry, B. M., Chen, H., and Li, S. X.: Wind measurements with 355-nm molecular Doppler lidar, Opt. Lett., 25, 1231–1233, 2000.



- Holben, B. N., Eck, T. F., Slutsker, I., Tanre, D., Buis, J. P., Setzer, A., Vermote, E., Reagan, J. A., Kaufman, Y. J., Nakajima, T., Lavenu, F., Jankowiak, I., and Smirnov, A.: AERONET – a federated instrument network and ata archive for aerosol characterization, Remote Sens. Environ., 66, 1–16, 1998.
- ⁵ IPCC: Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Solomon, S., Qin, D., Manning, M., Chen, Z., Marquis, M., Averyt, K. B., Tignor, M., and Miller, H. L., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge and New York, NY, 995 pp., 2007. Jahne, B.: Digital Image Processing, 4th edition, Springer, Germany, 555 pp., 1997.
- ¹⁰ Kambhamettu, C., Palaniappan, K., and Hasler, A. F.: Automated cloud-drift winds from GOES images, Proc. SPIE GOES-8 and Beyond, 122–133, 1996.

LAADS Web: Available at: http://ladsweb.nascom.nasa.gov/. last access: March–May, 2010. Leese, J. A., Novak, C. S., and Clark, B. B.: An automated technique for obtaining cloud motion from geosynchronous satellite data using cross-correlation, J. Appl. Meteorol., 10, 118–132, 1971.

Long, C. N., Slater, D. W., and Tooman, T.: Total Sky Imager Model 880 Status and Testing Results: Available at: http://www.arm.gov/publications/tech_reports/arm-tr-006.pdf, 2001. last access: 2 June, 2010.

15

20

25

Kummerow, C., Barnes, W., Kozu, T., Shiue, J., and Simpson, J.: The tropical rainfal measuring mission (TRMM) sensor package, J. Atmos. Ocean. Tech., 15, 809–817, 1998.

- Kiehl, J. T. and Trenberth, K. E.: Earth's annual global mean energy budget, B. Am. Meteorol. Soc., 78, 197–208, 1997.
- Koren, I., Remer, L. A., Altaratz, O., Martins, J. V., and Davidi, A.: Aerosol-induced changes of convective cloud anvils produce strong climate warming, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 10, 5001– 5010, doi:10.5194/acp-10-5001-2010, 2010.
- Mahesh, A., Walden, V. P., and Warren, S. G.: Ground-based infrared remote sensing of cloud properties over the Antarctic Plateau Part 1: cloud base heights, J. Appl. Meteorol., 40, 1265–1278, 2001.

Naud, C., Muller, J. P., and Clothiaux, E. E.: Comparison between active sensor and radiosonde

- ³⁰ cloud boundaries over the ARM Southern Great Plains site, J. Geophys. Res., 108, 4140, doi:10.1029/2002JD002887, 2003.
 - Pal, S. R., Steinbrecht, W., and Carswell, A. I.: Automated method for lidar detemination of cloud-base height and vertical extent, Appl. Optics, 31, 1488–1494, 1992.



Discussion Paper	AMTD 3, 4231–4260, 2010 A novel technique for extracting clouds base height		
per D			
iscussion F	E. Hirsch et al.		
ape	Title	Title Page	
P	Abstract	Introduction	
_	Conclusions	References	
Discuss	Tables	Figures	
ion	14	►I	
Paper	•	•	
_	Back	Close	
Discu	Full Screen / Esc		
ISSIO	Printer-friendly Version		
n Pap	Interactive Discussion		
er			

Platnick, S., King, M. D., Ackerman, S. A., Menzel, W. P., Baum, B. A., Riedi, J. C., and Frey, R. A.: The MODIS cloud products: algorithm and examples from Terra, IEEE T. Geosci. Remote, 41(2), 459–473, 2003.

Schafer, K., Emeis, S. M., Rauch, A., Munkel, C., and Vogt, S.: Determination of mixing layer heights from ceilometer data, Proc. SPIE, 5571, 248, doi:10.1117/12.565592, 2004.

- heights from ceilometer data, Proc. SPIE, 5571, 248, doi:10.1117/12.565592, 2004.
 Station Observations: Available at: http://weather.uwyo.edu/surface/meteogram/. last access: March–May, 2010.
 - Stephens, G. L., Vane, D. G., Boain, R. J., et al.: The cloudsat mission and the a-train, B. Am. Meteorol. Soc., 83, 1771–1790, 2002.
- Tan, D. and Andersson, E.: Simulation of the yield and accuracy of wind profile measurements from the Atmospheric Dynamics Mission (ADM-Aeolus), Q. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc., 131, 1737– 1757, 2005.

Wang, J. and Rossow, W. B.: Determination of cloud vertical structure from upper-air observations, J. Appl. Meteorol., 34, 2243–2258, doi:10.1175/1520-0450, 1995.

¹⁵ Winker, D. M., Pelon, J. R., and McCormick, M. P.: The CALIPSO mission: spaceborne lidar for observations of aerosols and clouds, Proc. SPIE, 4893, 1–11, 2003.



Fig. 1. CLOUDS SPECTATOR measurement assembly. It enables spatial, temporal, and multi spectral sky measurements.





AMTD 3, 4231-4260, 2010 A novel technique for extracting clouds base height E. Hirsch et al. Title Page Introduction Abstract Conclusions References Figures Tables Close Back Full Screen / Esc Printer-friendly Version Interactive Discussion



Fig. 3. Time series images of 40 × 40 pixels blocks of standard deviation corresponding to the thermal images shown in Fig. 2. Images are scaled between 0°C (blue) and 10°C (red).





Fig. 4. Automatic detection of cloud patches movement. 40×40 pixels blocks with high standard deviation values on the left image are tracked using spatial correlation on the right image. Blocks with matching colors represent the same region. Since our sensors were turned northward prior to the image acquisition, we can mark directions on the images. This will be used later to calculate the wind direction of the air layer in which these clouds are found.





Fig. 5. Intersecting theoretical possible wind speed profile derived from FOV (field of view) analysis (red line wrapped with green error limits), with wind speed profile measured by a radiosonde in a nearby station at Beit-Dagan (blue line). The heights at which these two lines intersect mark the possible heights of the clouds layer. Left: profile range 0–15 km. Right: zooming on 1250–1400 m. The black line is the relative humidity profile (notice how the lower crossing point at 1356 m corresponds to a sharp increase in the RH). The magenta line is the LCL height (1294 m) as derived by the radiosonde data (Bolton, 1980). The cyan line is the cloud base height (1311 m) extracted by a nearby ceilometer (website: "Station Observations").





Fig. 6. Comparing measured wind direction profile (blue line) with the wind direction extracted from our FOV analysis (red line with black error values of $\pm 15^{\circ}$). Notice that for the lower intersection point of the wind speed profile in Fig. 5, the wind direction is within the error limit of the ground measurement, but for the higher intersection point the wind direction deviates from our calculated value, therefore the only valid cloud base height is the lower point at 1356 m.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Fig. 7. Intersecting theoretical possible wind speed profile derived from FOV (field of view) analysis (red line wrapped with green error limits), with wind speed profile measured by a radiosonde in a nearby station at Beit-Dagan (blue line). The heights at which these two lines intersect mark the possible heights of the clouds layer. Left: profile range 0–15 km. Right: zooming on 900–1050 m. The black line is the relative humidity profile (notice how the intersection point at 934 m corresponds to a sharp increase in the RH). the magenta line is the LCL height (993 m) as derived by the radiosonde data (Bolton, 1980). The cyan line is the cloud base height (1036 m) extracted by a nearby ceilometer (website: "Station Observations").









Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Fig. 9. Left: crossing measured wind velocity (blue line) with hypothesized possible wind velocities from FOV analysis (red line with green error lines). Notice the crossing points correspond to a high humidity layer (black line). Right: Enlargement on the top crossing point.





Fig. 10. Wind direction profile as measured by a radiosonde. The calculated wind direction in the cloud layer is $236 \pm 15^{\circ}$.

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Fig. 11. MODIS cloud top pressure (210 hPa) and temperature (-59.05° C) products. The SPECTATOR location is marked with a black circle at (34.79° E, 31.92° N).







4258

Interactive Discussion

(cc)



Fig. 13. Left: crossing measured wind velocity (blue line) with hypothesized possible wind velocities from FOV analysis (red line with green error lines). Notice the crossing points correspond to a high humidity layer (black line). Right: zooming in on the 5310 m crossing point. The cyan line is the cloud base height (5182 m) extracted by a nearby ceilometer (website: "Station Observations").







