AD-A04	5 181	ARMY M INFRAR JUL 77	ED AND	RESEAR SUBMIL	CH AND	DEVELO	PMENT C CTION B	OMMAND Y FOG.	REDST	0ETC	F/G 4	/2		/
UNCLAS	I OF 1 AD A045181	- III -	DRDMI-	R-77-9	and the second second		gallin.							
														14
										, Andread Marine Million and Adulation	alamaida damaida	- 		
ytures) profilationer	END DATE FILMED 11 - 77 DDC													-1000
2														
				1.1									-	1





TECHNICAL REPORT TR-77-9

INFRARED AND SUBMILLIMETER EXTINCTION BY FOG

Physical Sciences Directorate Technology Laboratory

14 July 1977



Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.



AD A 0 4518

DMI FORM 1000, 1 APR 77

DISPOSITION INSTRUCTIONS

DESTROY THIS REPORT WHEN IT IS NO LONGER NEEDED. DO NOT RETURN IT TO THE ORIGINATOR.

DISCLAIMER

THE FINDINGS IN THIS REPORT ARE NOT TO BE CONSTRUED AS AN OFFICIAL DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY POSITION UNLESS SO DESIG-NATED BY OTHER AUTHORIZED DOCUMENTS.

TRADE NAMES

USE OF TRADE NAMES OR MANUFACTURERS IN THIS REPORT DOES NOT CONSTITUTE AN OFFICIAL INDORSEMENT OR APPROVAL OF THE USE OF SUCH COMMERCIAL HARDWARE OR SOFTWARE.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION	N PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
I. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
TR-77-9		
. TITLE (and Subtitle)		STYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERE
INFRARED AND SUBMILLIMETER I	EXTINCTION	Technical Report
BY FOG	- / /	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
	- Construction of the California	TR-77-9
AUTHOR()		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(*)
Dorathy Anne Stewart		(6)
PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRE	SS	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TAS
US Army Missile Research and Deve	lopment Command	DA(1L161102AH49) 7
Attn: DRDMI-TR Redstone Arsenal, Alabama 35809		AMCMS Code 611102. H49001
Commander	(I	14 July 1977
US Army Missile Research and Deve	lopment Command	13. NUMBER OF PAGES
Redstone Arsenal, Alabama 35809		61 (2)49kl
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(IT dillo	rent from Controlling Office)	15. SECURITY CLASS (of the second)
		UNCLASSIFIED
		154. DECLASSIFICATION DOWNGRADING
		SCHEDULE
6. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribu 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abotract onter	ution unlimited. ed in Block 20, if different fr	om Report)
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribu 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetract enter	ution unlimited. ed in Block 20, 11 different fi	oan Report)
 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract enter 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 	ution unlimited. ed In Block 20, If different fi	om Report)
 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract enter 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 9. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse aids if necessary For drop gizes Propagation 	and identify by block numbe	oan Report)
 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the Report) Approved for public release; distribution 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract enter on the abstract enter) 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde if necessary Fog drop sizes Propagation Visibility Infra red 	ution unlimited. ed in Block 20, if different fi end identify by block numbe	om Report)
 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract enter of the abstra	ution unlimited. ed in Block 20, if different fo end identify by block numbe	om Report)
 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstract enter of the ebstra	and identify by block number	om Report)
 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution statement (of the ebstract enter 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstract enter 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse eide if necessary Fog drop sizes Propagation Visibility Infrared Submillimeter 10. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse eide if necessary A thorough literature survey of discussed, and data from 36 reference 	and identify by block number and identify by block number and identify by block number and identify by block number block	om Report)
 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution statement (of the abstract enter 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract enter 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse aids if necessary Fog drop sizes Propagation Visibility Infrared Submillimeter 16. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse aids if necessary A thorough literature survey of discussed, and data from 36 reference The review of an extensive list tant information. Ranges of liquid w 	end identify by block number and identify by block number fog drop-size dis ces are summarize t of over 100 refere vater content and pr	or Report)
 16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution statement (of the ebstract enter 17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the ebstract enter 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES 19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse elde if necessary Fog drop sizes Propagation Visibility Infrared Submillimeter 10. ABSTRACT (Continue on coverse elde if necessary A thorough literature survey of discussed, and data from 36 reference The review of an extensive list tant information. Ranges of liquid w 	and identify by block number and identify by block number f fog drop-size dis ces are summarize t of over 100 refere vater content and pr ABS	our Report)

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Date Entered)

ABSTRACT (Concluded)

visibility are examined. Changes in fog characteristics from place to place and from time to time are also considered, and the discussion includes small-scale spatial and temporal fluctuations. \wedge

A representative sample of data is used to compute extinction of electromagnetic energy with wavelengths of 0.55, 10.5, 870, and 1250 μ m. Extinction of the 1250- μ m wavelength by fog droplets is always less than extinction of the 870- μ m wavelength. Extinction of the 870- μ m energy by fog droplets is always less than extinction of the visible and the 10.5- μ m energy. The relationship between the visible and the infrared extinction depends upon the drop-size distribution. The 10.5- μ m wavelength is frequently attenuated about the same amount as the visible, and it is not uncommon for the infrared extinction to be greater than the visible extinction.

UNCLASSIFIED SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Date Entered)

CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	3
п.	COMPUTATIONAL PROCEDURE	4
ш.	FOG DROP-SIZE DISTRIBUTIONS	10
IV.	COMPARISON OF EXTINCTION OF DIFFERENT WAVELENGTHS	28
v.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	35
REF	ERENCES	37



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to express her appreciation to Dr. Oskar M. Essenwanger for encouragement and helpful suggestions during this project. She would also like to thank Dr. Bobby D. Guenther for calling her attention to an important publication. Personnel at Redstone Scientific Information Center deserve credit for their extra efforts to obtain some obscure publications. Finally, thanks are due to Mrs. Clara B. Brooks for her care in typing the manuscript.

I. INTRODUCTION

Fog, mist, and haze are obstructions to visibility. Fog exists when the atmosphere contains a suspended aggregate of very small water drops which reduce the horizontal visibility to 1 km or less near the surface. When an aggregate of water droplets suspended in the atmosphere near the surface does not reduce visibility as low as 1 km, it is called mist. Mist is intermediate between fog and haze. Haze consists of particles which are so small they cannot be felt or individually seen with the eye. Haze particles may be dry or damp. More detailed definitions may be found in the <u>Glossary of Meteorology</u> (Huschke, 1959). Eldridge (1969) discusses alternate definitions which exist in the literature.

This report is primarily concerned with fog, but first, a few references will be listed for the reader who is interested in visibilities greater than 1 km. Wells et al. (1977), Hänel (1971), Mészaros (1971), and Laktionov (1967a) contain information about the size of particles and visibility as a function of relative humidity. Johnson (1976) shows that ultragiant aerosols with radii of 15 μ m and larger are not rare. Flanigan and DeLong (1970) and Hoidale and Blanco (1969) discuss measurements of infrared characteristics of dust. Gordin and Strelkov (1975) and Carlon (1970) consider infrared characteristics of very fine water aerosol.

Fog is formed by a variety of meteorological processes.

When the ground loses heat at night by radiational cooling through a clear atmosphere, radiation fog will form if the air cools enough to become supersaturated.

Advection fog is fog which forms when warm, moist air moves across water or land which has a lower temperature.

Frontal fog is associated with a frontal passage. Frontal fog may be caused by rain falling into cooler air or by mixing of different air masses near the frontal zone. Some authors call the former an evaporation fog and the latter a mixing fog.

An upslope fog is formed when air flows upward over rising terrain and cools adiabatically to the dew point.

Steam fog, which is also called evaporation fog, is formed when cold air moves over a warmer body of water or when warm rain falls through a layer of colder air.

Further information of a general nature may be found in standard references such as Berry et al. (1945), Huschke (1959), Landsberg (1958), and Schönwiese (1970).

Mathematical and numerical models describing different characteristics of fog are found in Baronti and Elzweig (1973), Lala et al. (1975), Low (1975b), Magono et al. (1974), Rodhe (1962, 1966), and Weinstein (1974a, b).

II. COMPUTATIONAL PROCEDURE

When electromagnetic energy propagates through an atmosphere which contains scattering and absorbing particles, the extinction coefficient σ , which is also called the attenuation coefficient, is given by the following formula:

 $\sigma = \sum_{i} \pi r_{i}^{2} (Q_{ext})_{i} N_{i} ,$

where r_i is the radius of particles in the ith interval which contains N_i particles per cubic unit of length. To be precise, the r_i^2 which is used in the computation should be the mean square radius over the interval. $(Q_{ext})_i$ is the mean extinction efficiency factor (also called the relative extinction coefficient or the normalized extinction cross section) in the ith radius interval. Q_{ext} is a dimensionless function of drop size, wavelength of electromagnetic energy, and the complex index of refraction. The extinction coefficient σ is in units of inverse length. If σ is in units of m⁻¹, the attenuation in decibels/kilometer may be obtained by multiplying by 4343.

Johnson (1954) has shown that if one assumes a threshold of brightness contrast of 0.02, one may compute the visibility V according to the formula

$$V = \frac{3.912}{\sigma}$$

,

where σ is computed for some wavelength near the middle of the visible range. If the units of σ are m⁻¹, the visibility is in meters.

Mie (1908) developed a theory to describe scattering and absorption of electromagnetic energy by spherical particles with a known complex index of refraction m = n - ik. Modern discussions and explanations of electromagnetic propagation theory can be found in Kerker (1969), McCartney (1976), Deirmendjian et al. (1961), Weeks (1964), Stephens et al. (1971), and Verner (1976). A summary of the procedure used in this report follows.

The extinction efficiency factor is related to the complex numbers $a \ n$ and $b \ n$ by the formula

$$Q_{\text{ext}} = \frac{2}{\alpha} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (2n+1) \left[\operatorname{Re}(a_n + b_n) \right]$$

The dimensionless parameter α is the ratio of the circumference of the drop to the wavelength of radiant energy and is defined by

•

$$\alpha = \frac{2\pi \mathbf{r}}{\lambda}$$

The wavelength λ must be expressed in the same units as the radius.

The quantities a_n and b_n are defined by

$$a_{n} = \frac{\psi_{n}(\alpha)\psi_{n}^{\dagger}(\beta) - m\psi_{n}(\beta)\psi_{n}^{\dagger}(\alpha)}{\xi_{n}(\alpha)\psi_{n}^{\dagger}(\beta) - m\psi_{n}(\beta)\xi_{n}^{\dagger}(\alpha)}$$

$$b_{n} = \frac{m\psi_{n}(\alpha)\psi_{n}^{\dagger}(\beta) - \psi_{n}(\beta)\psi_{n}^{\dagger}(\alpha)}{m\xi_{n}(\alpha)\psi_{n}^{\dagger}(\beta) - \psi_{n}(\beta)\xi_{n}^{\dagger}(\alpha)}$$

where $\beta = m\alpha$ and $\zeta = \psi + i\chi$. The prime denotes differentiation with respect to the argument. The quantities ψ and χ are Ricatti-Bessel functions defined as

,

$$\psi_{n}(x) = \left(\frac{\pi x}{2}\right)^{1/2} J_{n+1/2}(x)$$

and

$$\chi_{n}(x) = -\left(\frac{\pi x}{2}\right)^{1/2} N_{n+1/2}(x)$$

where $J_{n+1/2}(x)$ and $N_{n+1/2}(x)$ are half integral order Bessel and Neumann functions of any argument x.

For computational purposes, one may define the appropriate quantities for n = 0 and n = 1 and use an iterative procedure to obtain higher order terms

$$\psi_0(x) = \sin x$$

$$\psi_1(x) = \frac{\sin x}{x} - \cos x$$

$$\chi_0(x) = \cos x$$

$$\chi_1(x) = \frac{\cos x}{x} + \sin x$$

and

When x is a complex number such as β , the preceding functions transform into functions of hyperbolic sines and cosines according standard equations.

The equations for finding higher order terms of ψ and χ are

$$Z_{n+1}(x) = \frac{2n+1}{x} Z_n(x) - Z_{n-1}(x)$$

and

$$Z'_{n}(x) = \frac{n+1}{x} Z_{n}(x) - Z_{n+1}(x)$$
$$= \frac{1}{2n+1} \left[(n+1) Z_{n-1}(x) - n Z_{n+1}(x) \right] ,$$

where Z is either ψ or χ and x is α or β .

The accuracy of the computer programs has been checked by making test calculations for comparison with tables published by the US Bureau of Standards (1949), Gumprecht and Sliepcevich (1951), Penndorf (1957), Irvine and Pollack (1968), and Appendix J of McCartney (1976). Gumprecht and Sliepcevich, Penndorf, and McCartney only deal with real indices of refraction. Irvine and Pollack's tables are quite extensive. They cover many wavelengths and a few drop radii for complex indices of refraction of water and ice. The publication by the US Bureau of Standards is particularly useful for checking computations because it includes values of a and b and it considers real and complex indices of refraction.

One might also note that Chýlek (1975, 1977) has shown that the extinction efficiency factor approaches a limiting value of two as α becomes infinite for all values of the index of refraction, but the limiting value of the scattering efficiency factor is a function of the refractive index.

Mie theory is quite reliable for spherical scatterers. For example, Dobbins and Eklund (1977) have recently shown that the smallest scale of fluctuations predicted by the theory can be measured in the laboratory. Fog water droplets are nearly spherical, but ice particles are not spherical. Any reader interested in nonspherical particles is advised to consult Zerull et al. (1977).

Table 1 contains the indices of refraction which were used to make the computations discussed in Section IV of this report. These computations are not highly sensitive to small changes in the index of refraction, and the results would have been qualitatively the same if sources other than Davies et al. (1970) and Hale and Querry (1973) had been used.

A few other sources of data will be noted for the interested reader. Deirmendjian (1975), Downing and Williams (1975), Rozenberg (1974), Irvine and Pollack (1968), and Kislovskii (1959) contain indices of refraction for several wavelengths. Additional information about indices of refraction of water near 1 mm can be found in Chamberlain et al. (1973), Apletalin et al. (1970), and Goronina et al. (1966). The preceding references are concerned with pure water or ice, but Querry et al. (1977) have studied relative reflectance and complex refractive index in the infrared for various samples of saline environmental waters.

Figure 1 is a conventional graph of Q_{ext} versus α for wavelengths of 0.55 and 10.5 μ m. This graph has been slightly smoothed because the smaller scale ripple structure is not important for our purposes.

Source	Wavelength (µm)	Index of Refraction
Hale and Querry (1973)	0.55	1.333 - 1.96 (10 ⁻⁹) i
Hale and Querry (1973)	10.5 870	1.185 - 0.06621
Davies et al. (1970)	1250	2.630 - 1.1407 i

TABLE	1.	INDICES	OF	REFRACTION

*The index of refraction for $870 \,\mu\text{m}$ is an interpolated value.



In Figure 2, Q_{ext} is graphed as a function of droplet radius for wavelengths of 0.55, 10.5, and 870 μ m. This graph shows that extinction is actually greater for 10.5- μ m energy than for the visible energy when particles are larger than about 10 μ m in radius.

Table 2 contains a sample computation of extinction for a hypothetical fog drop-size distribution. The purpose of showing this computation is to demonstrate the relative importance of small and large drops to atmospheric extinction. It has sometimes been argued that many measurement techniques discriminate against small drops, and this computation should demonstrate the small importance of this fact. The hypothetical distribution differs from one of the measured distributions only in the first three radius intervals. No particles in the corresponding real distribution were recorded with radii less than 1 μ m. There were 5.5 particles per cubic centimeter in the 1- to 2- μ m radius interval and 4.8 particles per cubic centimeter in the 2- to 3-µm interval. Thus, the computed visibility for the hypothetical distribution in Table 2 is 221 m as compared with 248 m for the measured distribution. However, if the 0.9 particles per cubic centimeter with radii greater than $15 \,\mu m$ were removed from Table 2, and everything else remained the same, the computed visibility would be 245 m. Therefore, one sees that eliminating 170 particles per cubic centimeter with radii less than $3 \,\mu m$ for the distribution in Table 2 has almost the same effect as eliminating 0.9 particles per cubic centimeter with radii greater than $15 \,\mu$ m.

III. FOG DROP-SIZE DISTRIBUTIONS

Radii of fog drops range from less than 1 μ m to slightly over 100 μ m. This section will include information concerning variations from one place to another and from one fog to another in the same place. Although some variations are caused by biases in methods of measurement as suggested by Eldridge (1971), instrumental limitations cannot explain all of the variations in Table 3, which summarizes the data to be discussed in this section.

The very thorough investigation by Arnulf et al. (1957) in France is often quoted. The experimental work was done at St. Inglevert (Pas-de-Calais) near the sea and at Villacoublay, an airport near Paris. They measured drop-size distributions and extinction of several wavelengths in hazes and fogs. No radii greater than 15 μ m were shown on their graphs, and the main mode was near 2.5 μ m for all data. Large secondary modes did not appear. In hazes, the



TABLE 2. SAMPLE OF COMPUTATIONAL PROCEDURE FOR OBTAINING EXTINCTION COEFFICIENT

$\frac{\overline{z}}{\pi r_{i}^{2} N_{i} Q_{i}}$ for 10.5 μ m (km ⁻¹)	0.01	0.07	0.18	0.07	0.25	0.46	0.72	2.12	1.72	1.70	1.80	1.06	0.60
$\frac{2}{\pi r_{i}^{2}N_{i}Q_{i}}$ for 0.55 μ m (km ⁻¹)	0.23	0.91	1.11	0.27	0.65	0.88	1.12	2.84	2.01	1.78	1.72	0.95	0.51
$\frac{-\frac{2}{2}N_{i}}{(km^{-1})}$	0.1047	0.4068	0.4934	0.1201	0.3002	0.4193	0.5320	1.3450	0.9544	0.8514	0.8319	0.4573	0,2456
N _i (cm ⁻³)	100.0	55.5	24.8	3.1	4.7	4.4	4.0	7.6	4.2	3.0	2.4	1.1	0.5
$r_i^{\frac{2}{r}}$ (μm^2)	0.333	2.333	6.333	12.333	20.333	30.333	42.333	56.333	72.333	90.333	110.333	132.333	156.333
Radius Interval (µm)	0 to 1	1 to 2	2 to 3	3 to 4	4 to 5	5 to 6	. 6 to 7	7 to 8	8 to 9	9 to 10	10 to 11	11 to 12	12 to 13

TABLE 2. (Concluded)

a*							
$\frac{\overline{\pi r_{i}^{N}N_{i}Q_{i}}}{\text{for 10.5}\mu^{1}}$	0.72	0.51	0.60	0.68	0.00	00.00	0.94
$\frac{-\frac{2}{\pi r_{i}^{2}}N_{i}G_{i}}{\text{for } 0.55\mu\text{m}^{*}}$ (km ⁻¹)	0.59	0.41	0.47	0.53	0.00	0.00	0.73
$\frac{\overline{2}_{N_i}}{(km^{-1})}$	0.2864	0.1982	0.2265	0.2567	0.0000	0.0000	0.3585
N _i (cm ⁻³)	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.3
r_i^2 (μm^2)	182.333	210.333	240.333	272.333	306.333	342.333	380.333
Radius Interval (μm)	13 to 14	14 to 15	15 to 16	16 to 17	17 to 18	18 to 19	19 to 20

 $*\sigma(0.55) = 17.71 \text{ km}^{-1}$ and $\sigma(10.5) = 14.21 \text{ km}^{-1}$.

-	
-	
0	
-	
-	
4	
~	
-	
(r)	
1	
0	
-	
\cup	
-	
<u> </u>	
-	
0	
-	
r m	
-	
0	
0	
1-	
-	
1.4	
×.	
-	
0	
0	
TO	
01	
5	
-	
1-1	
4	
r .	
T_	
_	
5	
FH	
r-1	
~	
R	
R	
UR.	
UR	
SUR	
SUR	
ASUR	
ASUR	
EASUR	
EASUR	
IEASUR	
MEASUR	
MEASUR	
MEASUR	
F MEASUR	
F MEASUR	
DF MEASUR	
OF MEASUR	
OF MEASUR	
V OF MEASUR	
Y OF MEASUR	
IN OF MEASUR	
RY OF MEASUR	
RY OF MEASUR	
ARY OF MEASUR	
ARY OF MEASUR	
JARY OF MEASUR	
MARY OF MEASUR	
IMARY OF MEASUR	
MMARY OF MEASUR	
MMARY OF MEASUR	
JMMARY OF MEASUR	
UMMARY OF MEASUR	
SUMMARY OF MEASUR	
SUMMARY OF MEASUR	
SUMMARY OF MEASUR	
SUMMARY OF MEASUR	
SUMMARY OF MEASUR	
. SUMMARY OF MEASUR	
3. SUMMARY OF MEASUR	
3. SUMMARY OF MEASUR	
3. SUMMARY OF MEASUR	
E 3. SUMMARY OF MEASUR	
E 3. SUMMARY OF MEASUR	
LE 3. SUMMARY OF MEASUR	
LE 3. SUMMARY OF MEASUR	
3LE 3. SUMMARY OF MEASUR	
BLE 3. SUMMARY OF MEASUR	
ABLE 3. SUMMARY OF MEASUR	
ABLE 3. SUMMARY OF MEASUR	
TABLE 3. SUMMARY OF MEASUR	

Source	Typical Radii (μm)	Maximum Radius (μm)	Miscellaneous Information
Arnulf et al. (1957)	2.5	15	France
Best (1951)	5 to 12	40	From earlier work by Hagemann
Cong and Dessens (1973)	8 to 10	22	Localized near plume from pulp
	4.5 to 5.2	17	Widespread through valley
Deloncle (1963)	<1 <0.75	10 8	Urban, near Paris Mountain top, France
Dickson et al. (1975)	3.4	118	Capistrano, California
Donaldson (1955)	10 to 25	100	Massachusetts
Eldridge (1961)	<1	32	Massachusetts
Findeisen (1932)	1 to 4	60	Hamburg, Germany
Garland (1971)	<1 10	40 70	Radiation fogs, all water Radiation fogs, ice crystals
	4	60	Advection fogs
Garland et al. (1973)	<0.6	20	Radiation fogs
Gathman and Larson (1974)	3 to 9	64	Greenland Sea
Gorehakov (1972)	5.5 to 12.5		Russia

Source	Typical Radii (μm)	Maximum Radius (μm)	Miscellaneous Information
Grunow (1960)	1.5 4 to 7 6 to 9	7.5 12.5 30	Mt. Hohenpeissenberg, Germany Polar air Maritime air Continental air
Houghton and Radford (1938)	4 to 35	65	Typically advection fogs
Jiusto (1964)	5 10	17.5 32.5	Radiation Advection
Kozima et al. (1953)	2.5 to 7.5	55	Japan
Kumai (1973)	3.5 to 12.6	65	Point Barrow, Alaska; advec- tion fogs
Kunkel (1971)	5 to 10	45	Otis Air Force Base
Low (1975)	9 to 13 4 to 13	21	Radiation fog, Ft. Rucker, Alabama Mixed radiation-advection, California
Ludwig et al. (1974)	0.1	15	Radiation fog
Mack et al. (1973)	4 to 8	31	At sea

-	-
3	2
5	μ
- 5	2
.5	Ξ
4	3
2	=
0	C
C)
_	-
_	
	1
c	2
-	-
1	1
	ъ.
-	4
-	-
n I	
ABT	

Source	Typical Radii (μm)	Maximum Radius (μm)	Miscellaneous Information
May (1961)	<0.5 to 15	160	Salisbury Plain, England
Mészaros (1965)	<0.4 to 10	43.8 101 5	Budapest, Hungary Radiation
Okita (1962)	6 to 17	60	Radiation fogs in Japan
Pedersen and Todsen (1960)	5 ×	16 25	Oslo, Norway Radiation Advection
Pilié et al. (1975)	3 to 12	31	Chemung River Valley, New York
Reinking (1975)	з	7.5	San Joaquin Valley, California
Roberts (1976)	0.2 to 1.1	œ	Grafenwöhr, Germany
Rogers et al. (1974)	œ	115	California coast
Rozenberg (1974)	5 50		Thin Medium
Tag (1976)	œ	23	Panama Canal Zone

Source	Typical Radii (μm)	Maximum Radius (μm)	Miscellaneous Informatic
Tampieri and Tomasi (1976)	œ	22	Radiation fog, Italy
Thompson et al. (1967)	10	34	Otis Air Force Base
Thuman and Robinson (1953)	40 32 15		Ice prisms Ice hexagons Ice droxtals
Tverskoi (1965)	1.5 2	60 60	Radiation fog Evaporation fog
Webb (1956)	5 to 19	70	Washington, D. C. and Virginia
			0

TABLE 3. (Concluded)

optical densities were 10 to 15 times larger in the visible than at 10 μ m. In fogs which they called selective fogs atmospheric extinction of visible wavelengths varied from about 2 to over 20 times the extinction at a wavelength of 10 μ m. In evolving fogs, visible wavelengths were attenuated from about 1.4 to 20 times the wavelength of 10 μ m. In stable fogs the 10- μ m attenuation was always at least half the visible attenuation, and in some stable fogs attenuation at 10 μ m was almost as much as in the visible.

Best (1951) discussed a paper published by Hagemann (1936) from Hamburg, Germany, but Best's paper is probably more readily available. The peaks of the drop-size distributions illustrated in Hagemann's Figure 6 were typically from about 5- to 12- μ m radius. Maximum drop sizes measured by Hagemann were near 40 μ m, and most samples contained a considerable number of drops with radii greater than 10 μ m. The samples in Hagemann's original articles showed that many distributions were multimodal, and this was unfortunately lost in Best's parameterization.

Bimodal and multimodal distributions have also been inadequately parameterized by most other investigators. Essenwanger (1976) pointed this out in his discussion of Mallow (1975). Rensch and Long (1970), Baronti and Elzweig (1973), and Tampieri and Tomasi (1976a, b) also used distribution functions which allowed only a single mode.

Cong and Dessens (1973) made measurements in France on the upper Garonne River near a pulp mill which ejected 65 tons of water vapor per hour into the atmosphere. Measurements were made in a valley where wind speeds were light or it was calm, and there were frequent inversions. They studied two fogs which were spread throughout the valley basin and two fogs which were localized in the vicinity of the falling from the plume emitted by the pulp mill. Drops were larger in the localized fogs which had mean radii of 8 and $10 \ \mu m$. Maximum radii were about $22 \ \mu m$. Mean radii in the more widespread fogs were 4.5 and 5.2 μm , and maximum radii were about $17 \ \mu m$. In both cases, large numbers of drops had radii greater than $10 \ \mu m$.

Deloncle (1963a, b) studied fogs near Paris and on a mountain, Puy-de-Dôme, in France. Near Paris, most drops had radii less than $1 \mu m$; the maximum radius was about $10 \mu m$. Some of these distributions were bimodal (see Figure 5 of Deloncle, 1963a) with a secondary maximum near $5.5 \mu m$. Deloncle found smaller drops on the mountain Puy-de-Dôme. Maximum radii were about $8 \mu m$, and the largest number of drops had radii less than $0.75 \mu m$. Even the secondary modal radius was only about $1.5 \mu m$. Dickson et al. (1975) made extensive measurements at Capistrano Test Site in California. Most of the data were in the form of computer printouts, but a typical example of fog was discussed in Volume I. The maximum radius of drops measured in this example was $118 \,\mu$ m, but most drops had radii less than $82 \,\mu$ m. The main modal radius was about $3.4 \,\mu$ m, and there were very small secondary modes at 9.4, 12.6, and 19.4 μ m. Other fluctuations appeared to be too small to consider significant. The liquid water content was about 0.17 g/m^3 .

Donaldson (1955) made measurements near Buzzard's Bay in Massachusetts. According to Donaldson's Figure 6, volume mean radii in his samples varied from 16 to about $35 \,\mu\text{m}$. Therefore, the linear mean radii probably varied from about 10 to $25 \,\mu\text{m}$. From Donaldson's Figure 2, one sees that no large secondary modes were apparent, and the maximum dropsize was about 2.8 times the volume mean. It follows that the maximum dropsize must have been near 100- μ m radius. Liquid water contents varied from about 0.013 to 0.16 g/m³.

Eldridge (1961) found that in 11 of 14 samples the number of drops increased monotonically as the droplet radius decreased. The smallest drop-size class in Eldridge's Tables 2 and 3 was 0.5- to 1- μ m radius. The largest class was for radii from 16 to 32 μ m. In 2 of the 14 samples, the mode was in the 1- to 2- μ m class; one sample had the mode in the 2- to 4- μ m class. The liquid water content varied from 0.039 to 0.365 g/m³.

Findeisen (1932) measured drop-size distribution in fogs in Hamburg, Germany. All the samples illustrated in Findeisen's Figures 6 and 7 had large numbers of small drops and were multimodal. There were large numbers of drops with radii greater than 10 μ m. The five distributions in Findeisen's Figure 7 had at least one small secondary maximum with these larger radii. The maximum radius was about 60 μ m.

Garland (1971) had 25 sets of measurements in a table. The fogs were classified according to whether they were judged to be radiation fogs or advection fogs. Most calculated visual ranges were a little more than observed visual ranges and, perhaps, some small drops were missed. In radiation fogs with no ice crystals, droplet radii varied from 0.3 to 40 μ m. In a radiation fog which consisted entirely of ice, the radii varied from 6 to 70 μ m. In advection fogs the radii varied from 0.4 to 60 μ m. Garland's table did not give a typical or average radius, but I have estimated values from the information which was given and from the graphs. Most drops apparently had radii less than $1 \,\mu\text{m}$ in the liquid radiation fogs. Ice fogs had typical radii greater than $6 \,\mu\text{m}$, probably at least $10 \,\mu\text{m}$. Advection fogs on the graphs in Figure 3 had typical radii from 2 to $8 \,\mu\text{m}$. Liquid water was in the range of 0.023 to $0.173 \,\text{g/m}^3$.

Garland et al. (1973) studied only radiation fogs. In five out of six samples the largest drops had radii of about $15 \,\mu$ m; one sample had a drop with a radius as large as $20 \,\mu$ m. In five out of six samples the category containing the most drops was less than $0.6 \,\mu$ m. Large secondary modes did not

occur. The liquid water content varied from 0.05 to 0.21 g/m³.

Gathman and Larson (1974) observed many atmospheric variables in three fogs in the Greenland Sea. They believed that their method of measurement was 100% efficient in collecting particles with radii greater than $1.0 \,\mu\text{m}$. Median radii in their 15 fog samples varied from 3 to $9 \,\mu\text{m}$ according to their Table 2. Their graphs were hard to read, but maximum drop radii apparently varied from about 32 to $64 \,\mu\text{m}$ in their Figures 8, 9, and 10. Calculated liquid water contents were in the range of 0.041 to 0.251 g/m³.

Gorchakov et al. (1972) made assumptions about the fog drop-size distributions and used an optical scattering technique to estimate the parameters in the distribution function for three cases. In two cases the modal radius was about $5.5 \,\mu\text{m}$. They were surprised that in the third case the mode was near $12.5 \,\mu\text{m}$, and the particle size distribution was quite narrow compared to the other two cases.

Grunow (1960) investigated fogs on Mt. Hohenpeissenberg in upper Bavaria in Germany. He found that cold polar air was characterized by droplets from 1- to 7.5- μ m radius. Warm maritime air masses normally had droplets with radii from 2 to 12.5 μ m. Maritime air masses with a long continental trajectory had droplets from 2.5 to 30 μ m. Typical droplets in these three kinds of air masses had radii of 1.5, 4 to 7, and 6 to 9 μ m, respectively.

Houghton and Radford (1938) studied advection fogs at Round Hill in South Dartmouth, Massachusetts. They obtained 40 volume distribution curves in 16 fogs having peaks from 6- to 45- μ m radius. The range of radii was from 1 to 65 μ m. Because the linear mean of radii is less than the radius of a droplet of mean volume, typical radii were probably from about 5 to 35 μ m. The largest liquid water content was about 0.3 g/m³. Jiusto (1964) summarized a literature survey and divided fogs into two main types: radiation and advection. He assumed that inland fogs were radiation fogs and that coastal fogs were of the advection type. The average radius of radiation fog droplets was $5 \,\mu$ m, and the maximum was about 17.5 μ m. The liquid water content was about 0.11 g/m³. The larger advection fog droplets had an average radius of about 10 μ m and a maximum near 32.5 μ m. The liquid water content of advection fog was assumed to have an average of about 0.17 g/m³. Jiusto (1974), in a later article, has pointed out that these simplified numbers represent only typical values that will vary considerably in individual cases and with local conditions.

Kozima et al. (1953) divided the fog drop-size distributions that they measured in Hokkaido, Japan into four groups. Fogs containing particles with radii greater than 30 μ m were type D. Type D typically had the largest number of particles in the smallest size category, and the number of particles decreased monotonically with increasing size. In type A fogs, 70% of the particles had radii less than 5 μ m. In type B fogs, less than 70% of the drops had radii less than 5 μ m and less than 35% had radii greater than 10 μ m. More than 35% of the drops had radii greater than 10 μ m in type C fogs, but none had radii greater than 30 μ m. The largest radii measured by Kozima et al. were 55 μ m.

Kumai's (1973) investigation of advection fogs in Point Barrow, Alaska, found maximum radii of $65 \,\mu$ m. The categories with most drops varied from 3.5- to 12.6- μ m radius. Observed visibilities were slightly smaller than computed visibilities; therefore, some small drops were missed. In Figure 5 of Kumai's article, visibility was plotted versus liquid water content. There was a lot of scatter in the data, and the long-lasting fogs showed far more scatter than the short-period fogs. When visibilities were 1 km or less, the amount of liquid water varied from 0.033 to 0.15 g/m³.

Kunkel (1971) used a laser hologram camera to measure drop sizes in fogs. During part of the test, his instrument would only measure large drops. A cascade impactor was used to fill in additional data. During the remainder of the test, droplets with radii as small as $2 \,\mu$ m could be measured. Kunkel's Figure 3 indicated that radii near $45 \,\mu$ m were measured. From his Figure 4, which represented measurements made entirely with one type of instrument, one sees that typical radii were from 5 to $10 \,\mu$ m. The number of grams of liquid water varied from 0.021 to 0.148.

Laktionov et al. (1973) studied statistical characteristics of fog in Russia. They found that the number of droplets with radii less than 8 μ m was negatively correlated with the number of droplets with radii greater than 12 μ m. For example, the number of droplets with radius 18 μ m had about a -0.4 correlation with the number of droplets with a radius of 0.45 μ m. If this should be true in other locations, one would not have to worry that numerous small drops were missed by the measurement technique in fogs with large numbers of large drops. The discussion in Section II of the present report also indicates that small drops contribute much less to extinction than large drops.

Low (1975a) reported on two sets of measurements. The first was done by Dickson at Skelly Field near Ft. Rucker, Alabama. This fog was the radiation type. The wind varied from calm to about 1 m/ sec throughout most of its existence. Typical radii were from 9 to $13 \,\mu$ m, and maximum radii were about

21 µm. Liquid water content at Skelly Field varied from 0.14 to 0.21 g/m².

The second set of measurements reported by Low were in Redwood Valley near Arcata, California. These measurements were made by Bonner and White, but Low has included corrections to errors which were found in their orginial work. The Redwood Valley fogs were of a mixed radiation-advection type but Low believed that they were predominately radiational. Typical radii were from 4 to $13 \,\mu$ m. Information about the maximum radii in the Redwood Valley fogs was not given. The maximum liquid water content was $0.65 \,\text{g/m}^3$ and the minimum was $0.04 \,\text{g/m}^3$.

Ludwig et al. (1974) measured droplet size distributions in radiation fog at Brannan Island State Park in the delta of the San Joaquin and Sacramento Rivers. According to their Figures 12 and 24 the largest number of particles were the smallest ones less than a few tenths of a micrometer in radius, and the maximum radius was about $15 \,\mu$ m.

Mack et al. (1973) measured fog parameters at sea near Monterey, California, and near the Farallon Islands. Figures 5 and 6 of their report contained many histograms of drop-size distributions. The peaks typically occurred at radii from about 4 to 8 μ m, and most drop sizes were in the range of 2- to 16- μ m radius. Several distributions were multimodal. The largest radius shown on the graphs was about 31 μ m. Drizzle occurred during the two most thoroughly studied fogs. It was qualitatively estimated that droplet radii were as large as 100 μ m. The maximum liquid water content was 0.18 g/m³. May (1961) studied 28 fogs. The method of measurement discriminated against very large and very small droplets. May believed that one could not place an upper limit on the size of a fog droplet because the spectrum merged continuously into that of drizzle or rain when it accompanied a fog. In any case, May's Table 2 indicated a range of droplet radii of 0.25 to 160 μ m. In 9 of the 28 fogs the maximum droplet radius was greater than 53 μ m and in 11 fogs the maximum radius was less than 28 μ m. Other characteristics of the fogs showed a wide variation even though all measurements were taken from the same position on the side of a building on open Salisbury Plain in England. One sample had a minimum radius of 8 μ m, and another sample had a maximum radius greater than 32 μ m. One sample had a median radius less than 0.5 μ m but a maximum radius greater than 32 μ m. One sample had a median radius of 15 μ m. Liquid water contents which were obtained by weighing varied from 0.0044 to 0.27 g/m³. Magnitudes computed from the drop-size distributions ranged from 0.0043 to 0.297 g/m³.

Mészaros (1965) studied 26 radiation fogs and 13 advection fogs in Budapest, Hungary. Mészaros' Tables I and II listed a great deal of information about each fog, including mode radius, mean radius, mean square radius, mean volume radius, and maximum radius. In the 26 radiation fogs the mode radius varied from less than 0.4 to $10.2 \,\mu$ m, and the mean radius varied from 3.7 to $10.6 \,\mu$ m. Maximum radii in the radiation fogs were in the range from 18.5 to $43.8 \,\mu$ m. Mean liquid water content in the radiation fogs was $0.062 \,\text{g/m}^3$. Average droplets in the 13 advection fogs were larger than the radiation fog droplets. The principal modal radius varied from 2.1 to $12.9 \,\mu$ m. Two advection fogs were bimodal, and in one of these the secondary mode was at 28.0 μ m. Mean radii were from 2.2 to 17.0 μ m in the advection fogs. Maximum radii in the advection fogs varied from 31.5 to 101.5. In the advection fogs the average liquid water content was only $0.022 \,\text{g/m}^3$, much less than in the radiation fogs.

Okita (1962) examined drops in four radiation fogs in Hokkaido, Japan. Okita made measurements from the surface to 250 m. The largest drops near the surface had radii of 60 μ m. Mean radii varied from 6 to 17 μ m according to Okita's Figure 20. The maximum liquid water content was about 0.4 g/m³ near the surface. Pedersen and Todsen (1960) measured fog droplet sizes near Oslo, Norway. The fogs classified as radiation fogs had maximum radii of about 16 μ m, and advection fog droplets had radii as large as 25 μ m. Typical distributions of both kinds of fog were bimodal, and one mode was from 5 to 7 μ m. In radiation fogs, one mode was typically less than 2 μ m, and in advection fogs one mode was near 2 μ m.

Pilié et al. (1975a, b) made extensive micrometeorological measurements in 11 fogs in the Chemung River Valley near Elmira, New York. Measurements were made aloft as well as near the surface. The broadest drop-size distributions always occurred near the surface. Deep fog formed first aloft with its base 30 to 60 m above the surface, but ground fog a few meters thick could result from diffusion of heat to the cold ground. The temperature distribution leading to the formation of a deep valley fog appeared to be the result of nocturnal valley circulations. Further radiative cooling of the fog top produced an unstable lapse rate, and subsequent turbulence caused the fog base to propagate downward to the surface. Typical radii were from 3 to $12 \,\mu$ m, and the maximum radius was about $31 \,\mu$ m. Most distributions in mature fog at the surface were very broad and multimodal. The average

liquid water content at the time of minimum visibility was 0.1 g/m 3 .

Reinking (1975) studied warm radiation fogs under calm conditions in the San Joaquin Valley in California. Maximum radii were about $7.5 \,\mu$ m, and typical mean radii were near $3 \,\mu$ m. Detailed information was not given.

Roberts (1976) obtained drop-size distributions from Grafenwöhr, Federal Republic of Germany. Roberts' Figure 1, which showed plots of five drop-size distributions, did not indicate that there were any particles with radii greater than 8 μ m. Most of the distributions had a maximum near the smallest size shown on the curves, about 0.2 μ m. One of the distributions had a maximum at slightly more than 1 μ m and a secondary maximum at about 7.25 μ m. Roberts' Figure 5 showed that even the small variation in drop-size distributions produced measurable changes in extinction for liquid water contents appropriate to moderate and light fog and mists, although the observations were quite close together for very large liquid water contents and for relatively

clear air. For example, for a liquid water content of about 0.007 g/m^3 , extinction of the $10-\mu\text{m}$ wavelength of energy varied by about a factor of 3, and for about 0.08 g/m^3 extinction varied by a factor of 2. Observations were scarce near 0.03 g/m^3 .

Rogers et al. (1974) investigated the life cycle of California coastal fogs about 1 nmi inland near Vandenberg Air Force Base. The range of radii was typically 1.5 to $115 \,\mu$ m, and the mean radius at a height of 1.2 m was 8.4 μ m according to their Table III. Graphical data were not given for 1.2 m but only for heights of 13 m and higher. At the higher levels the distributions tended to peak at about 5- to 7- μ m radius. The average liquid water content was 0.08 g/m³, and the maximum was 0.12 g/m³ at the 1.2 m height.

Rozenberg (1974) has summarized expected mean drop sizes for different hydrometeors on page 279 in Table 6.14 of the English translation of the Russian report. The mean droplet radius was $5 \,\mu$ m in thin fogs and $50 \,\mu$ m in medium fogs.

Tag (1976) discussed earlier work which was based on data taken in the Panama Canal Zone. Tag's Figure 2 indicated a maximum radius of about $23 \,\mu\text{m}$. Typical radii would be less than the volume mean radius of $10.8 \,\mu\text{m}$. The liquid water content was $0.39 \,\text{g/m}^3$.

Tampieri and Tomasi (1976a) have fit various drop-size distributions to a modified gamma function. A report describing a study by Vittori and Pesaresi at Baricella in the Po Valley in Italy was among the published work which they discussed. Maximum drop radii were about 22 μ m and typical radii were about 8 μ m in the fogs in the Po Valley. Tampieri and Tomasi classified these fogs as radiation fogs.

Thompson et al. (1967) have described a laser hologram camera system for measuring drop sizes. Their article contained one sample histogram of data taken at Otis Air Force Base, Massachusetts. Typical radii were near $10 \,\mu$ m, and the maximum radius was about $34 \,\mu$ m.

Thuman and Robinson (1954) studied Alaskan ice-fog particles. The highest temperature at which ice-fog occurred was -30 °C during the winter of 1952–1953 at Eielson Air Force Base. Thuman and Robinson were primarily concerned with crystal size as a function of temperature. The minimum size appearing in their Figure 7 was about $13 \,\mu$ m.

Tverskoi (1965) classified fogs as radiation and evaporation fogs in Figure 107, page 324, of the English translation. Two radiation fogs had modal radii between 1 and 2 μ m. The graphs showed one radiation fog to have a maximum radius of about 5.5 μ m and the other a maximum of 11.5 μ m. The modal radius of the evaporation fog was about 2 μ m and the maximum about 10 μ m. However, Tverskoi stated on a later page that the maximum radii in the fogs were about 60 μ m.

Webb (1956) gave three representative drop-size distributions in his Figure 4. The radiation fog at Pimmit Green, Virginia, had a modal radius of about $5\,\mu$ m, but the graph was hard to read and the maximum radius was uncertain. Information in the figure caption about the two curves from Washington, D. C., was not consistent with information in Webb's Table 1. One distribution had a modal radius near 7.5 μ m and few drops had radii larger than 11 μ m. The other curve was distinctly bimodal with peaks at 14 and 19 μ m radius. This distribution with the large drops was probably the advection fog. It had more drops with radii greater than 20 μ m than with radii less than 10 μ m. The maximum radius was near 70 μ m. Webb stated that although droplets of 0.3 μ m radius could not be seen with certainty, droplets with radii of 0.75 μ m were easy to measure by his technique.

In spite of the large amount of work that has been done in measuring fog drop-size distributions, more studies are needed.

It is obvious that in some locations the nature of fog drop-size distributions can change drastically from one time to another. This has been shown very clearly by Grunow (1960), May (1961), and Mészaros (1965). Therefore, the reader is cautioned against assuming that any values in Table 3 are always valid for the specified location. However, there may be places where the life cycle of a fog is almost always similar, but systematic measurements over a period of years will be necessary to demonstrate this.

It should also be noted here that changes in fog characteristics can have very small space and time scales. Richer (1970) found appreciable changes in propagation at 140 GHz (2142 μ m) within a fog during a time when no apparent changes in visibility occured. In Richer's experiment, attenuation increased from 15 to 23 dB/km in a 30-sec period and then decreased to 15 dB/km during the following 30 sec. Zuev et al. (1972) probed a fog with a 0.6943- μ m laser. Oscillogram traces of reflected signals showed rapid fluctuations indicating that the inhomogeneities of the fog were in constant motion. George (1972) studied a fog in Washington, D.C., and the length of most elements fell within the range of 50 to 100 ft. Chisholm and Kruse (1974) made mesoscale measurements of visibility at L. G. Hanscom Field in Massachusetts. They found that temporal and spatial variability was much greater in radiation fogs than in advection fogs.

A few investigators have discussed the variation of drop-size distributions during the life cycle of a fog. Pilié et al. (1975b) made one of the most thorough studies of the life cycle of valley fog. They found that shallow ground fog usually occurred before the formation of deep valley fog. The ground fog had mean radii of 2 to $4 \,\mu\text{m}$ and a range of 1 to $10 \,\mu\text{m}$. As deep fog formed aloft, mean radii near the surface increased to 6 to 12 µm. Small droplets occurred again at the first visibility minimum after which a bimodal distribution developed at the surface in about half of the fogs. One mode was at a radius of 2 to 3 µm and the other between 6 and 12 µm. Pilié et al. found no consistent change in the shape of drop-size distributions during fog dissipation, but Laktionov (1967b), in a study near Moscow, found that the number of larger drops decreased during fog dissipation. However, Dickson and Hales (1963) have made theoretical computations of visibility changes based upon the assumption that droplets become larger as fog ages. Dickson and Hales did not specifically state that this behavior carried through to the final dissipation stages; their belief was based primarily upon the laboratory part of Findeisen's (1932) study. Low (1975a) examined the life cycles of one radiation fog and four mixed radiation-advection fogs. In the radiation fog, the mean and median radii increased with time from the formative stage to the end of the mature stage and then decreased slightly during dissipation. Behavior was not consistent among the four mixed radiation-advection fogs.

Another characteristic of fogs which has aroused interest is the liquid water content. Many people, including Eldridge (1971) and Barteneva and Polyakova (1965), have suggested that liquid water content should be a simple function of visibility. However, Barteneva and Polyakova's own data in their Figure 2 showed a lot of scatter. Eldridge considered possible observational errors in only two sets of data to conclude that they should be very close together. Koester and Kosowsky (1970) suggested using two relationships: one for radiation fog and one for advection fog. This oversimplification had the merit of illustrating very clearly the pitfall of casually using any equation one might find in the literature. They suggested maximum liquid water contents of 1.0 and 0.4 g/m³ for radiation and advection fogs, respectively. The earlier part of this section of the present report indicates that most fogs have a liquid water content less than 0.4 g/m^3 . Roberts (1976) measured values slightly more than 1.0 g/m³. Low (1975a) reported 0.65 g/m³ with a visibility of 84 m. In industrial regions of Bohemia in Czechoslovakia Anyz (1964) measured liquid water contents greater than 0.5 g/m^3 with visibilities in excess of 100 m. This could only occur if there were many large drops. Anyz measured 0.606 g/m³ a short time after the last visibility measurement.

The preceding discussion applies to observations near the surface. Very few observations exist for higher levels, but in one case Okita (1962) observed a liquid water content of 1.6 g/m^3 at a height of 50 m. Rogers et al. (1974) also found that average and maximum liquid water content increased with height,

but at 42 m the largest measured liquid water content was only 0.4 g/m^3 . Stalenhoef (1974) found that slant visibility from 40 m was normally less than horizontal visibility at 2 m.

Finally, the reader is urged to remember that a few large drops can make a bigger contribution to extinction than many small drops as has been illustrated in Table 2. This is particularly true at 10.5 μ m, where extinction is comparable to visible extinction for particles with radii greater than 10 μ m. Therefore, the typical radii in Table 3 must not be considered alone without reference to the number of large drops. A maximum radius greater than 30 μ m was usually an indication of a significant number of large particles.

IV. COMPARISON OF EXTINCTION OF DIFFERENT WAVELENGTHS

Drop-size distributions were taken from six articles. Kumai (1973) and Eldridge (1966) listed data in convenient tabular form. Thirteen of the distributions from Kumai were associated with visibilities less than 1 km and thus came within the definition of fog used in this report. Kumai's fogs typically contained 20 to 40% of radii greater than 10 μ m, and no radii were less than 2.85 µm. Eldridge's 12 fog drop-size distributions had no radii greater than $8 \,\mu\text{m}$, and most were less than $1 \,\mu\text{m}$. Pilié et al. (1975b) and Pedersen and Todsen (1960) provided graphs which were fairly easy to read. Typically, over 10% of radii from Pilié et al. were greater than 10 µm, but only a few percent from Pedersen and Todsen were greater than $10 \,\mu m$. Data were taken from 27 graphs of mature fogs of Pilié et al. and from 3 graphs of Pedersen and Todsen. Garland (1971) and Garland et al. (1973) provided graphs which were difficult to read, but they did provide some supplementary information in tables. Five drop-size distributions were used from each article, and the droplets were typically small. Altogether, extinctions were computed for 65 drop-size distributions.

Figures 3 through 7 illustrate the results of computations made with the 65 drop-size distributions according to the procedure described in Section II.







Figure 4. Comparison of attenuation of 10.5- and 0.55-µm radiation by fog droplets.



mu–0321 70 (mx/Ab) NOITAUNATTA 27319090 203 Y8 NOITAIDAЯ





ST3J90AD A3TAW Y8 mu-03St 30 (ma/8b) NOITAUN3TTA



2T3J9080 001 Y8 NOITAIDAR mu-0321 30 (ma/8b) NOITAUN3TTA

Figure 7. Comparison of attenuation of 1250- and 870- μ m radiation by fog droplets.

Figures 3 and 4 show the relation between attenuations of visible and infrared energy. Figure 3 is a plot of visibility as a function of attenuation at 10.5 μ m. There is obviously a great deal of scatter in the data. An attenuation of 50 dB/km at 10.5 μ m can be associated with visibilities considerably less than 100 m or over 300 m. If the data are plotted with both axes in units of decibels per kilometer as in Figure 4, the scatter is still obvious. The correlation of the data in Figure 4 is only 0.61.

Before comparing these data with the work of others one should consider the following facts. The index of refraction of water does not vary much throughout the visible. Except for the very small drops with radii less than $3 \,\mu\text{m}$, the mean Q_{ext} over a reasonable drop-size interval is about the same for different visible wavelengths. The index of refraction of water at 10.5 μm is close to that for wavelengths from 10.0 to 10.6 μm , and the parameter $\alpha = 2\pi r/\lambda$ does not vary a lot over this wavelength interval.

Bisyarin et al. (1971) made comparisons of attenuation at 10.6 μ m with attenuation at 0.63 μ m in real and laboratory fogs. The mean ratio of attenuation at 10.6 μ m to attenuation at 0.63 μ m was 0.38 for several real fogs and 0.43 for laboratory fogs. It was indicated that about 15% of their ratios were less than 0.20 and about 15% were greater than 0.60 in the real fogs. Sample data in their Figure 5 showed that they were including visibilities greater than 1 km under their definition of fog.

Chu and Hogg (1968) plotted a graph of wavelength versus expected

attenuation by fogs with 0.1 g/m³ of liquid water. Their estimate for 10.5 μ m was 50 dB/km. Some of the fogs in Figures 3 and 4 which attenuated 10.5 μ m about 50 dB/km had a liquid water content near 0.1 g/m³.

Donati (1973) considered the problem of imaging through hazes and fogs. Calculations indicated that for high visibilities penetration of fog by 10 μ m was much greater than penetration by visible energy. Under conditions of low visibility, the infrared offered only modest improvement over the visible.

Johnston and Burch (1967) measured the ratio of $10.0-\mu m$ attenuation to $0.546-\mu m$ attenuation in artificial fogs in the laboratory. Ratios were measured from 0.54 to 0.79 according to their Table II. Rensch and Long (1970) used a model of fog drop-size distribution for theoretical computations. It was found that when the radius of drops with the maximum number density was greater than $5\,\mu$ m, the extinction coefficient became wavelength independent for wavelengths from 0.34 to 10.6 μ m. In my computations, most of the distributions with the radius of maximum number density greater than $5\,\mu$ m had 0.55- and 10.5- μ m attenuations within about 10% of each other.

Figure 5 shows the relation of visible and $1250 - \mu m$ attenuation. These data contain even more scatter than the data in Figure 4. The correlation coefficient for the two attenuations is only 0.49. The correlation between 0.55- μm attenuation and 870- μm attenuation is 0.58.

Figure 6 shows that 10.5- μ m attenuation is more closely related to 1250- μ m attenuation in fog than it is to 0.55- μ m attenuation. The correlation between these two sets of data is 0.9664.

The correlation between 10.5- μ m attenuation and 870- μ m attenuation is 0.9668 for the 65 fog drop-size distributions used in this study.

Figure 7 contains a plot of $870 - \mu m$ attenuation versus $1250 - \mu m$ attenuation. It is obvious that these data are very closely correlated. The correlation coefficient is 0.9873.

Platt (1970) made various approximations and computed an attenuation by fog at 1000 μ m of 15.2 dB/km per g/m³.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Extinction of electromagnetic energy by fog droplets depends upon the wavelength of the energy, the complex index of refraction of the drops for that wavelength, and the drop-size distribution.

No clear air attenuation is considered in this report. Webster (1973) has provided a good model of atmospheric molecular attenuation. Water vapor will be considered in a future report. This report considers the following four wavelengths: $0.55 \,\mu\text{m}$ in the visible; $10.5 \,\mu\text{m}$ in the infrared; $870 \,\mu\text{m}$ in the submillimeter range; and $1250 \,\mu\text{m}$. Measurements of the complex indices of refraction at these wavelengths for water do not vary much more than about 10% in any study. Variations are much less for the shorter wavelengths. Furthermore, the results of the computations are not influenced much by small changes in the complex index of refraction.

An extensive literature survey shows that the radius of fog droplets can vary from less than $1 \,\mu\text{m}$ to more than $100 \,\mu\text{m}$. However, a large portion of drops have radii less than $20 \,\mu\text{m}$, and few radii are greater than $40 \,\mu\text{m}$. In some fogs the maximum radius is as small as $7.5 \,\mu\text{m}$, but in other fogs more than half the drops have radii greater than $8 \,\mu\text{m}$. These large variations sometimes occur in one location. There may also be large spatial and temporal variations within a fog.

Extinction of energy with a wavelength of 1250 μ m is less than extinction of energy with a wavelength of 870 μ m, regardless of the fog drop-size distribution.

The extinction of these wavelengths near 1 mm by fog droplets is less than the extinction of 0.55 and 10.5 μ m in all fogs.

The way the extinction coefficient of $10.5 - \mu m$ energy compares to the extinction coefficient of $0.55 - \mu m$ energy depends upon the drop-size distribution. If the maximum drop radius is less than $10 \ \mu m$, extinction of a wavelength of $10.5 \ \mu m$ is less than extinction of a wavelength of $0.55 \ \mu m$. If most of the drop radii are greater than $10 \ \mu m$, the extinction of energy with a wavelength of $10.5 \ \mu m$ is greater than the extinction of energy with a wavelength of $10.5 \ \mu m$ is greater than the extinction of energy with a wavelength of $10.5 \ \mu m$ is greater than the extinction of energy with a wavelength of $0.55 \ \mu m$. Even a concentration of a fraction of a drop per cubic centimeter with a radius near $30 \ \mu m$ is important because the contribution of a drop to the extinction coefficient depends upon the square of the radius. Computations based upon fog drop-size distributions found in the literature indicate that extinction of the $10.5 - \mu m$ wavelength is about the same as the extinction of the $0.55 - \mu m$ wavelength in many fogs.

REFERENCES

- Anyz, F., 1964: "Measurement of Water Content of Fogs in Industrial Regions," (in Russian). Studia Geophysica et Geodaetica, 8, 395-404.
- Apletalin, V. N., V. V. Meriakri, and Y. Y. Chigryay, 1970: "Measurement of the Absorbing and Reflecting Properties of Water at Wavelengths from 2 to 0.8 mm," Radio Eng. Elect. Phys., 15, 1286-1288.
- Arnulf, A., J. Bricard, E. Curé, and C. Véret, 1957: "Transmission by Haze and Fog in the Spectral Region 0.35 to 10 microns," J. Opt. Soc. Amer., 47, 491-498.
- Baronti, P. and S. Elzweig, 1973: "A Study of Droplet Spectra in Fogs," J. Atmos. Sci., 30, 903-908.
- Barteneva, O. D. and E. A. Polyakova, 1965: "A Study of Attenuation and Scattering of Light in a Natural Fog Due to its Microphysical Properties," Atmos. Oceanic Phys., 1, 114-121.
- Berry, F. A., E. Bollay, and N. R. Beers (Editors), 1945: <u>Handbook of</u> Meteorology, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, pp. 727-736.
- Best, A. C., 1951: "Drop-Size Distribution in Cloud and Fog," Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc., 77, 418-426.
- Bisyarin, V. P., I. P. Bisyarina, and A. V. Sokolov, 1971: "Attenuation of 10.6 µm Laser Radiation in Artificial and Real Fog," <u>Radio Eng. Elect.</u> Phys., 16, 1589-1594.
- Carlon, H. R., 1970: "Infrared Emission by Fine Water Aerosols and Fogs," Appl. Optics, 9, 2000-2006.
- Chamberlain, J., M. S. Zafar, and J. B. Hasted, 1973: "Direct Measurement of Refraction Spectrum of Liquid Water at Submillimetre Wavelengths," Nature, Phys. Sci., 243, 116-117.
- Chisholm, D. A. and H. Kruse, 1974: <u>The Variability of Visibility in the</u> <u>Hanscom Mesonetwork: A Preliminary Assessment</u>. Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories Report AFCRL-TR-74-0265, Environmental Research Paper AFCRL-ERP-479, NTIS Catalog No. AD-784791, 32 pp.

- Chu, T. S. and D. C. Hogg, 1968: "Effects of Precipitation on Propagation at 0.63, 3.5, and 10.6 microns," The Bell System Tech. J., 47, 723-759.
- Chýlek, P., 1975: "Asymptotic Limits of the Mie-Scattering Characteristics," J. Opt. Soc. Amer., 65, 1316-1318.
- Chýlek, P., 1977: "A Note on Extinction and Scattering Efficiencies," J. Appl. Meteor., 16, 321-322.
- Cong, L. P. and J. Dessens, 1973: "Brouillards Artificiels Produits par Émission Industrielle de Vapeur d'Eau" J. Rech. Atmos., 7, 109-116.
- Davies, M., G. W. F. Pardoe, J. Chamberlain, and H. A. Gebbie, 1970: "Submillimetre- and Millimetre-Wave Absorptions of Some Polar and Non-polar Liquids Measured by Fourier Transform Spectorscopy," Trans. Faraday Soc., 66, Part 2, 273-292.
- Deirmendjian, D., 1975: "Far-Infrared and Submillimeter Wave Attenuation by Clouds and Rain," J. Appl. Meteor., 14, 1584-1593.
- Deirmendjian, D., R. Clasen, and W. Viezee, 1961: "Mie Scattering with Complex Index of Refraction," J. Opt. Soc. Amer., 51, 620-633.
- Deloncle, M., 1963a: "Constitution des Brouillards Urbains," J. Rech. Atmos., 1, 107-111.
- Deloncle, M., 1963b: "Étude Photoélectrique des Aérosols Volatils," <u>Revue</u> d'Optique Théorique et Instrumentale, 42, 157-196.
- Dickson, D. R. and J. V. Hales, 1963: "Computation of Visual Range in Fog and Low Clouds," J. Appl. Meteor., 2, 281-285.
- Dickson, D. H., R. B. Loveland, and W. H. Hatch, 1975: <u>Atmospheric</u> <u>Waterdrop Size Distribution at Capistrano Test Site (CTS) from 16 April</u> <u>through 11 May 1974, Volumes I, II, III, IV, V, and VI.</u> Report ECOM-DR 75-3.
- Dobbins, R. A. and T. I. Eklund, 1977: "Ripple Structure of the Extinction Coefficient," Appl. Optics, 16, 281-282.
- Donaldson, R. J., 1955: "Drop-Size Distribution, Liquid Water Content, Optical Transmission, and Radar Reflectivity in Fog and Drizzle."
 <u>Proc. Fifth Wea. Radar Conf.</u>, 12-15 September 1955, Asbury Park, New Jersey, 275-280.

- Donati, S., 1973: "Thermal Imaging Through Hazes and Fogs in the Middle and Far Infrared Windows: Some Experimental Results," <u>Alta Frequenza</u> (English Edition), 42, 101-104.
- Downing, H. D. and D. Williams, 1975: "Optical Constants of Water in the Infrared," J. Geophys. Res., 80, 1656-1661.
- Eldridge, R. G., 1961: "A Few Fog Drop-Size Distributions," J. Meteor., 18, 671-676.
- Eldridge, R. G., 1966: "Haze and Fog Aerosol Distributions," J. Atmos. Sci., 23, 605-613.
- Eldridge, R. G., 1969: "Mist the Transition from Haze to Fog," <u>Bull</u>. Amer. Meteor. Soc., <u>50</u>, 422-426.
- Eldridge, R. G., 1971: "The Relationship Between Visibility and Liquid Water Content in Fog," J. Atmos. Sci., 28, 1183-1186.
- Essenwanger, O. M., 1976: Comments on "Empirical Fog Droplet Size Distribution Functions with Finite Limits," J. Atmos. Sci., 33, 338-339.
- Findeisen, W., 1932: ''Messungen der Grösse und Anzahl der Nebeltropfen zum Studium der Koagulation Inhomogenen Nebels,'' <u>Gerlands Beitraege</u> zur Geophysik, 35, 295-340.
- Flanigan, D. F. and H. P. DeLong, 1970: Spectral Absorption Characteristics of the Major Components of Dust Clouds. Edgewood Arsenal Technical Report EATR 4430, 57 pp.
- Garland, J. A., 1971: "Some Fog Droplet Size Distributions Obtained by an Impaction Method," Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc., 97, 483-494.
- Garland, J. A., J. R. Branson, and L. C. Cox, 1973: "A Study of the Contribution of Pollution to Visibility in a Radiation Fog," <u>Atmos. Environ-</u> ment, 7, 1079-1092.
- Gathman, S. G. and R. E. Larson, 1974: <u>Marine Fog Observations in the</u> <u>Arctic</u>. Naval Research Laboratory Report 7693, NTIS Catalog Number AD-778999, 27 pp.

- George, D. H., 1972: "Estimates of Fog Element Length," J. Appl. Meteor., <u>11</u>, 874-876.
- Gorchakov, G. I., A. A. Isakov, and L. N. Markina, 1972: "Determination of the Basic Parameters of Fog Microstructure from the Coronal Indicatrix," <u>Atmos. Oceanic Phys.</u>, 8, 50-53.
- Gordin, M. P. and G. M. Strelkov, 1975: "The Passage of Laser Radiation Through a Fine-Droplet Water Aerosol," <u>Radio Eng. Elect. Phys., 20</u>, <u>No. 10</u>, English, pp. 1-7.
- Goronina, K. A., R. K. Belov, and E. P. Sorokina, 1966: "Dielectric Constant Measurement Based on the Variation of the Polarization of Reflected Waves," Sov. Radiophys., 9, 567-569.
- Grunow, J., 1960: "The Productiveness of Fog Precipitation in Relation to the Cloud Droplet Spectrum," <u>Physics of Precipitation, Geophysical</u> <u>Monograph Number 5, American Geophysical Union, pp. 110-117.</u>
- Gumprecht, R. O. and C. M. Sliepcevich, 1951: <u>Tables of Light-Scattering</u> <u>Functions for Spherical Particles</u>. Engineering Research Institute, Special Publications: Tables, University of Michigan, 593 pp.
- Hagemann, V., 1936: "Eine Methode zur Bestimmung der Grösse der Nebelund Wolkenelemente," Gerlands Beitraege zur Geophysik, 46, 261-282.
- Hale, G. M. and M. R. Querry, 1973: "Optical Constants of Water in the 200-nm to 200-µm Wavelength Region," <u>Appl. Optics.</u>, 12, 555-563.
- Hänel, G., 1971: "New Results Concerning the Dependence of Visibility on Relative Humidity and Their Significance in a Model for Visibility Forecast," <u>Beitr. Phys. Atmos.</u>, 44, 137-167.
- Hoidale, G. B. and A. J. Blanco, 1969: "Infrared Absorption Spectra of Atmospheric Dust Over an Interior Desert Basin," <u>Pure Appl. Geophys.</u>, <u>74</u>, 151-164.
- Houghton, H. G. and W. H. Radford, 1938: "On the Measurement of Drop Size and Liquid Water Content in Fogs and Clouds," <u>Papers Phys.</u> Oceanogr. Meteor., 6, No. 4, 31 pp.

- Huschke, R. E. (Editor), 1959: <u>Glossary of Meteorology</u>. American Meteorological Society, Boston, Massachusetts, 645 pp.
- Irvine, W. M. and J. B. Pollack, 1968: "Infrared Optical Properties of Water and Ice Spheres," <u>Icarus</u>, 8, 324-360.
- Jiusto, J. E., 1964: Investigation of Warm Fog Properties and Fog Modification Concepts. NASA Contract Report CR-72, Contract NASr-156, Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, Buffalo, New York.
- Jiusto, J. E., 1974: "Remarks on Visibility in Fog," J. Appl. Meteor., 13, 608-610.
- Johnson, J. C., 1954: <u>Physical Meteorology</u>. Published jointly by the Technology Press of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 403 pp.
- Johnson, D. B , 1976: "Ultragiant Urban Aerosol Particles," <u>Science</u>, <u>194</u>, 941-942.
- Johnston, D. R. and D. E. Burch, 1967: "Attenuation by Artificial Fogs in the Visible, Near Infrared, and Far Infrared," Appl. Optics, 6, 1497-1501.
- Kerker, M., 1969: <u>The Scattering of Light and Other Electromagnetic Radia-</u> <u>tion</u>. Academic Press, New York, pp. 27-75.
- Kislovskii, L. D., 1959: "Optical Characteristics of Water and Ice in the Infrared and Radiowave Regions of the Spectrum," <u>Optics and Spectro-</u> <u>scopy</u>, 7, 201-206.
- Koester, K. L and L. H. Kosowsky, 1970: "Attenuation of Millimeter Waves in Fog," Fourteenth Radar Meteorology Conference, Preprints, 231-236.
- Kozima, K., T. Ono, and K. Yamaji, 1953: "The Size Distribution of Fog Particles," <u>Studies on Fogs</u>, Hokkaido University, 303-309.
- Kumai, M., 1973: "Arctic Fog Droplet Size Distribution and its Effect on Light Attenuation," J. Atmos. Sci., 30, 635-643.
- Kunkel, B. A., 1971: "Fog Drop-Size Distributions Measured with a Laser Hologram Camera," J. Appl. Meteor., 10, 482-486.

- Laktionov, A. G., 1967a: "On the Connection Between the Condensation Activity of Irradiated Nuclei and Their Sizes," <u>Atmos. Oceanic Phys.</u>, <u>3</u>, 13-17.
- Laktionov, A. G., 1967b: "Variation of the Size and Concentration of Drops During the Scattering of Fog," <u>Atmos. Oceanic Phys.</u>, 3, 321-323.
- Laktionov, A. G., Yu. S. Lyubovtseva, and M. S. Malkevich, 1973: "Certain Statistical Characteristics of Aerosol Microstructure in the Surface Layer of the Atmosphere," Atmos. Oceanic Phys., 9, 73-76.
- Lala, G. G., E. Mandel, and J. E. Jiusto, 1975: "A Numerical Evaluation of Radiation Fog Variables," J. Atmos. Sci., 32, 720-728.
- Landsberg, H., 1958: <u>Physical Climatology</u>. Gray Printing Co., DuBois, Pennsylvania, pp. 138-141.
- Low, R. D. H., 1975a: "Microphysical Evolution of Fog." J. Rech. Atmos., 9, 23-32.
- Low, R. D. H., 1975b: "Microphysical and Meteorological Measurements of Fog Supersaturation," <u>Tellus</u>, 27, 507-513.
- Ludwig, F. L., S. Schechter, R. C. Robbins, and J. H. Smith, 1974:
 <u>Condensation Nuclei and Aerosol Populations Related to Fog Formation</u>.
 Final Report II, SRI Project 6676, prepared under Army Contract
 DAHC04-67-C-0059, completed December 1973 and printed January 1974, 212 pp.
- McCartney, E. J., 1976: Optics of the Atmosphere, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 408 pp.
- Mack, E. J., R J Pilié, W. C. Kocmond, 1973: <u>An Investigation of the</u> <u>Microphysical and Micrometeorological Properties of Sea Fog</u>. Calspan No. CJ-5237-M-1, 40 pp.
- Magono, C., T. Harimaya, and S. Adachi, 1974: "An Observation of the Modification of a Mesoscale Cold Air Mass Over a Warm Sea Surface, Utilizing the Height and Temperature of Steam Fog Top," J. Meteor. Soc. Japan, 52, 491-497.

- Mallow, J. V., 1975: "Empirical Fog Droplet Size Distribution Functions with Finite Limits," J. Atmos. Sci., 32, 440-443.
- May, K. R., 1961: "Fog-Droplet Sampling Using a Modified Impactor Technique," <u>Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.</u>, <u>87</u>, 535-548.
- Mészaros, A., 1965: "Concentration et Distribution Dimensionnelle des Gouttelettes de Brouillards Atmosphériques," J. Rech. Atmos., 2, 53-64.
- Mészaros, A., 1971: "On the Variation of the Size Distribution of Large and Giant Atmospheric Particles as a function of the Relative Humidity," <u>Tellus</u>, 23, 436-440.
- Mie, G., 1908: "Beiträge zur Optik Trüber Medien, Speziell Kolloidaler Metallösungen," <u>Annalen der Physik, 25</u>, fourth series, 377-445.
- Okita, T., 1962: "Observations of the Vertical Structure of a Stratus Cloud and Radiation Fogs in Relation to the Mechanism of Drizzle Formation," <u>Tellus</u>, <u>14</u>, 310-322.
- Pedersen, K. and M. Todsen, 1960: "Some Measurements of the Microstructure of Fog and Stratus Clouds in the Oslo-Area," <u>Geofysiske Publikasjoner</u>, <u>21</u>, No. 7, 1-16.
- Penndorf, R., 1957: "New Tables of Total Mie Scattering Coefficients for Spherical Particles of Real Refractive Index," J. Opt. Soc. Amer., 47, 1010-1015.
- Pilié, R. J., E. J. Mack, W. C. Kocmond, C. W. Rogers, and W. J. Eadie, 1975a: "The Life Cycle of Valley Fog, Part I: Micrometeorological Characteristics," J. Appl. Meteor., 14, 347-363.
- Pilié, R. J., E. J. Mack, W. C. Kocmond, W. J. Eadie, and C. W. Rogers, 1975b: "The Life Cycle of Valley Fog, Part II: Fog Microphysics," J. Appl. Meteor., 14, 364-374.
- Platt, C. M. R., 1970: "Transmission of Submillimeter Waves Through Water Clouds and Fogs," J. Atmos. Sci., 27, 421-425.

- Querry, M. R., W. E. Holland, R. C. Waring, L. M. Earls, and M. D. Querry, 1977: "Relative Reflectance and Complex Refractive Index in the Infrared for Saline Environmental Waters," <u>J. Geophys. Res.</u>, <u>82</u>, 1425-1433.
- Reinking, R. F., 1975: Project Foggy Cloud VII Warm Fog Dispersal and Prevention (Preliminary Summary). Naval Weapons Center Technical Memorandum 2527, 30 pp.
- Rensch, D. B. and R. K. Long, 1970: "Comparative Studies of Extinction and Backscattering by Aerosols, Fog, and Rain at 10.6 μ and 0.63 μ ," Appl. Optics, 9, 1563-1573.
- Richer, K. A., 1970: "Environmental Effects on Radar and Radiometric Systems at Millimeter Wavelengths," <u>Proc. Symposium on Submillimeter</u> <u>Waves</u>, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, 31 March - 2 April 1970, pp. 533-543.
- Roberts, R. E., 1976: <u>Atmospheric Transmission Modeling: Proposed</u> <u>Aerosol Methodology with Application to the Grafenwöhr Atmospheric</u> <u>Optics Data Base</u>. Institute for Defense Analysis Paper P-1225, 24 pp.
- Rodhe, B., 1962: "The Effect of Turbulence on Fog Formation," <u>Tellus</u>, <u>14</u>, 49-86.
- Rodhe, B., 1966: "The Concentration of Liquid Water in the Atmosphere," Tellus, 18, 86-104.
- Rogers, C. W., E. J. Mack, U. Katz, C. C. Easterbrook, and R. J. Pilié, 1974: <u>The Life Cycle of California Coastal Fog Onshore</u>. Calspan Report No. CJ-5076-M-3 for Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories, Cambridge, Massachusetts, AFCRL-TR-74-0419, 85 pp.
- Rozenberg, V. I., 1974: <u>Scattering and Attenuation of Electromagnetic Radia-</u> <u>tion by Atmospheric Particles</u>. NASA Technical Translation F-771 of a Russian Hydrometeorological Press Publication in Leningrad in 1972, 339 pp.
- Schönwiese, V. C. D., 1970: "Zur Systematik der Nebelerscheinungen," Wetter and Leben, 22, 185-190.

- Stalenhoef, A. H. C., 1974: "Slant Visibility During Fog Related to Wind Speed, Air Temperature and Stability," <u>Arch. Meteor. Geophys.</u> Bioklim., Ser. B., 22, 351-361.
- Stephens, J. J., P. S. Ray, and R. J. Kurzeja, 1971: "Far-Field Transient Backscattering by Water Drops," J. Atmos. Sci., 28, 785-793.
- Tag, P. M., 1976: "A Numerical Simulation of Warm Fog Dissipation by Electrically Enhanced Coalescence: Part I. An Applied Electric Field," J. Appl. Meteor., 15, 282-291.
- Tampieri, F. and C. Tomasi, 1976a: "Size Distribution Models of Fog and Cloud Droplets in Terms of the Modified Gamma Function," <u>Tellus</u>, 28, 333-347.
- Tampieri, F. and C. Tomasi, 1976b: "Size Distribution Models of Fog and Cloud Droplets and Their Volume Extinction Coefficients at Visible and Infrared Wavelengths," <u>Pure and Appl. Geophys.</u>, <u>114</u>, 571-586.
- Thompson, B. J., J. H. Ward, and W. R. Zinky, 1967: "Application of Hologram Techniques for Particle Size Analysis," <u>Appl. Optics</u>, 6, 519-526.
- Thuman, W. C. and E. Robinson, 1954: "Studies of Alaskan Ice-Fog Particles," J. Meteor., 11, 151-156.
- Tverskoi, P. N., 1965: <u>Physics of the Atmosphere</u>. Translated from Russian for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the National Science Foundation, NASA TTF-288 TT65-50114, 314-343.
- US National Bureau of Standards Computation Laboratory, 1949: <u>Tables of</u> <u>Scattering Functions for Spherical Particles</u>. Applied Mathematics <u>Series</u>, 4. Washington, D.C., US Government Printing Office, Printed 1948, issued January 1949, 120 pp.
- Verner, B., 1976: 'Note on the Recurrence Between Mie's Coefficients,''
 J. Opt. Soc. Amer., 66, 1424-1425.
- Webb, W. L., 1956: "Particulate Counts in Natural Clouds and Fogs," J. Meteor., 13, 203-206.

- Webster, D. W., 1973: Military Potential of the Extreme Infrared: Technology and Applications. Naval Weapons Center Report TP 5565. Catalogued under AD915347.
- Weeks, W. L., 1964: <u>Electromagnetic Theory for Engineering Applications</u>. John Wiley and Sons, New York, 744 pp.
- Weinstein, A. I., 1974a: <u>Air Pollution and Warm Fog Modification</u>, Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories Report AFCRL-TR-74-0289, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Environmental Research Paper AFCRL-ERP-480, NTIS Catalog No. AD-786454, 16 pp.
- Weinstein, A. I., 1974b: "Air Pollution and Warm Fog Dispersal," <u>Proc. Conf.</u> on Wea. Modification, Amer. Meteor. Soc., 18-21 November 1974, pp. 282-285.
- Wells, W. C., G. Gal, and M. W. Munn, 1977: "Aerosol Distributions in Maritime Air and Predicted Scattering Coefficients in the Infrared," Appl. Optics, 16, 654-659.
- Zerull, R. H., R. H. Giese, and K. Weiss, 1977: "Scattering Functions of Nonspherical Dielectric and Absorbing Particles vs Mie Theory," <u>Appl.</u> Optics, 16, 777-778.
- Zuev, V. E., I. V. Samokhvalov, and Yu. S. Balin, 1972: "Investigation of the Ground Layer of the Atmosphere and Clouds Using Laser Location," <u>Sov.</u> Phys. J., 15, 730-732.

DISTRIBUTION

	No. of		No. of
	Copies		Copies
US Army Missile R&D Command		Optical Science Consultants	
Basic Distribution List	34	ATTN: Dr. D. L. Fried	1
		P. O. Box 388	
Defense Documentation Center		Torba Linda, Camorna 52000	
Cameron Station	19	ADTC/XRCF	
Alexandria, Virginia 22314	12	ATTN: D Dingus	1
a la de Clate University		Fulin Air Force Base, Florida 32542	
Colorado State University		ogini ini Force Babe, Frentia	
ATTN: Brof E Poiter	1	Commander	
Fort Colling, Colorado, 80523		AFATL/LMT	
Fort comme, colorado 50525		Eglin Air Force Base. Florida 32544	1
Office of Naval Research/Code 221		- g.m	
ATTN. D. C. Lewis	1	Commander	
800 N Quincy Street		US Army Dugway Proving Ground	
Arlington, Virginia 22217		ATTN: Meteorology Division	1
Artington, Arguna		Dugway, Utah 84022	
Pacific Missile Test Center			
Code 3253		Commander	
ATTN: Charles Phillips	1	US Army Artillery Combat	
Point Mugu, California 93042		Developments Agency	
		Fort Sill, Oklahoma 73504	1
Commander			
US Continental Army Command		Commander	
ATTN: Reconnaissance Branch	1	US Army Artillery and Missile School	
ODSC for Intelligence		ATTN: Target Acquisition Department	1
Fort Monroe, Virginia 23351		Fort Sill, Oklahoma 73504	
Commander		Commander	
US Army Test and Evaluation Command		US Army Communications -	
ATTN: NBC Directorate	1	Electronics Combat Development Agency	
AMSTE-EL	1	Fort Huachuca, Arizona 85613	1
-BAF	1		
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland 21005		Commander	
		Desert Test Center	
Commander		Fort Douglas, Utah 84113	1
US Army Cold Regions			
Research and Engineering Laboratories		Commander	
ATTN: Environmental Research Branch	1	US Army CBR School	
Hannover, New Hampshire 03755		Kart McClallan Alabama 36205	1
		Fort McClenan, Alabama 50205	
Commander		Commander	
US Army Ballistics Research Laboratories	1	USAE Air Weather Service (MATS)	
ATIN: AMABR-B	1	ATTN: AWS/DNTI	1
-LA	1	Scott Air Force Base, Illinois 62225	
Allin: Ken Richer Abardson Proving Ground Maryland 21005		ocou nil Force Dice, Lines	
Aberdeen Froving Ground, Maryland 21000		Commander	
Commandor		US Army Combined Arms Combat	
US Army Edrawood Arsenal		Development Activity	
ATTN: SMUEA_CS-O	1	Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 66027	1
Operations Research Group			
Edgewood Argenal, Maryland 21010		Chief of Naval Operations	
Eugewood mesenary mary and arrest		ATTN: Code 427	1
Commander		Department of the Navy	
US Army Frankford Arsenal		Washington, D.C. 20350	
ATTN: SMUFA-1140	1	지 그 것은 것은 것이 잘 다 보고 있다. 같은 것을	
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19137		Chief	
		US Weather Bureau	
Commander		ATTN: Librarian	1
US Army Picatinny Arsenal	1	Washington, D.C. 20235	
ATTN: SMUPS-TV-3	'1		
Dover, New Jersey 07801			
		7	

	No. of Copies		No. of Copies
Control Data Corporation		Lockheed-California Company	
Research Division		Department 72 - 25	
ATTN: Dr. Belmont	1	ATTN: Dr. L. Baer	1
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55440		Burbank, California 91503	
Georgia Institute of Technology		Massachusetts Institute of Technology	
Engineering Experiment Station		ATTN: Department of Meteorology	1
ATTN: James Gallager 347 Forst Drive	1	Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139	
Atlanta, Georgia 30332		Meteorological and Geosstrophysical	
(Abstract	
Director		Editorial Office	
US Army Engineer		P. O. Box 1736	
Waterways Experiment Station		Washington, D.C. 20013	
ATTN: WESSR	1		
Vicksburg, Mississippi 39101		The Rand Corporation	
		ATTN: Dr. S. J. Dudzinsky, Jr.	2
Director		1700 Main Street	
Atmospheric Sciences Program		Santa Monica, California 90406	
Washington D.C. 20550	1	Commandon	
washington, D.C. 20000	1	Conton for Neugl Appluage	
Director		ATTN: Document Control	1
Bureau of Research and Development		1401 Wilson Boulevard	1
Federal Aviation Agency		Arlington, Virginia 22209	
Washington, D.C. 20553		in ingraad below	
		Martin Company	
Commander		ATTN: Engineering Library	1
US Army Aviation Systems Command		Mail J1-398	
12th and Spruce Streets		Baltimore, Maryland 21203	
St. Louis, Missouri 63166	1		
Dise (e)		National Bureau of Standards	
Director		Boulder Laboratories	
us Army Air Mobility Research		ATTN: Library	1
Amea Research Center		Boulder, Colorado S0302	
Moffett Field, California 94035	1	Navy Ronresontativo	
control conditional control		National Climatic Center	
Director of Meteorological Systems		Arcade Building	
Office of Applications (FM)		Asheville, North Carolina 28801	1
National Aeronautics and Space			
Administration		National Oceanic and Atmospheric	
Washington, D.C. 20546	1	Administration	
		National Climatic Center	
Environmental Research Institute		ATTN: Technical Library	1
of Michigan		Arcade Building	
ATTN: Anthony J. LaBoose		Asneville, North Carolina 28801	
Robert L. Spellicy	1	Director	
P. O. Box 618	1	Defense Advanced Research Projects	
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48107		Agency	
		1400 Wilson Boulevard	
Kaman Nuclear		Arlington, Virginia 22209	1
ATTN: Lora Guy, Assistant Librarian	1		
Garden of the Gods Road		Honeywell, Inc.	
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80907		Systems and Research Division	
		ATTN: Dr. Paul Kruse	1
Lockneed Missile and Space Company		Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413	
ATTN, Mr. H. P. Allinson			
ATTA MI, D. G. Allison	1		
Sunnyugle, California 94099			

	No. of		No. of
	Copies		Copies
Raytheon Company		University of Wisconsin	
ATTN: A. V. Jelalian	1	ATTN: Prof. Weinman	1
528 Boston Post Road		Prof. E. Wahl	1
Sudbury, Massachusetts 01776		Madison, Wisconsin 53706	
National Aconautics and Space		US Army Engineering Topographic	
Administration		Laboratories	
Marshall Space Flight Center		Earth Sciences Division	
ATTN: R-AERO-Y	1	ATTN: ETL-GS-ES, Dr. William B. Brierly	1
Marshall Space Flight Center.		Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060	
Alabama 35812			
		Commander	
National Center for Atmospheric		US Army Research Office	
Research		ATTN: Dr. R. Lontz	4
ATTN: Library	1	P. U. Box 12211	
Boulder, Colorado 80302		North Carolina 27709	
Director of Defense Research and		US Army Research and Standardization	
Engineering		Group (Europe)	
Engineering Technology		ATTN: DRXSN-E-RX	
ATTN: Mr. L. Weisberg	2	Dr. Alfred K. Nedoluha	2
Washington, D.C. 20301		Box 65	
		FPO New York 90510	
Office of Chief Communications-			
Electronics		US Army Materiel Development and	
Department of the Army		Readiness Command	
ATTN: Electronics Systems Directorate	i	ATTN: Dr. Gordon Bushy	1
Washington, D.C. 20315		Dr. James Bender	1
		Dr. Edward Sedlak	1
Office, Assistant Chief of Staff for		5001 Eisenhower Avenue	
Intelligence		Alexandria, Virginia 22333	
Department of the Army			
ATTN: ACSI-DSRSI	1	Commander	
Washington, D.C 20310		US Army Tank Automotive Development	
		Command	
Office of US Naval Weather Service		Warner MUNICE 18000	1
US Naval Air Station		warren, Michigan 48090	
Washington, D.C. 20390	1	Commandan	
Office Acceletant Secondary of Defense		US Army Mobility Fourment Regearch	
December of Engineering		and Development Command	
ATTN: Technical Library	1	Fort Bolyoir Virginia 22060	
Washington D.C. 20301		fort betton, virginia 22000	
washington, D.C. 20001		Commander	
Pennavlyania State University		US Army Harry Diamond Laboratories	
ATTN: Department of Meteorology	1	2800 Powder Mill Road	
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802		ATTN: Dr. Stan Kulpa	1
currently rand, roundyname		Adelphi, Maryland 20783	
Commander			
US Air Force Avionics Laboratory		Commander	
ATTN: D. Rees	1	US Army Armament Command	
CPT James D. Pryce, AFAL/WE	1	ROCK Island, Illinois 61202	1
Dr. B. L. Sowers, AFAL/RWI	1	Commenter	
Wright Patterson Air Force Base,		US Amer Family Solars and Tashada	
Onio 45433		Center	
University of Washington		Federal Office Building	
A FTN: Department of Meteorology	1	220 7th Street, NE	
Seattle, Washington 98105		Charlottesville, Virginia 22901	1
second and an and a second			
University of Chicago			

Ur Department of Meteorology Chicago, Illinois 60637

1

	Copies	ć	op
Commander		The Aerospace Corporation	
US Army Training and Doctrine Command		ATTN: Dr. D. T. Hodges, Jr.	1
Fort Monree, Virginia 23351	1	C. M. Randall Box 92957	3
Director		2350 East El Serundo Boulevard	
Ballistic Missile Defense Advanced Technology Center		Los Angeles, California 90009	
ATTN: ATC-D	1	Headquarters	
ATC-O	1	Department of the Army	
ATC-R	1	ATTN: DAEN-RDM/Dr. F. de Percin	1
ATC-T P. O. Box 1500	1	Washington, D.C. 20314	
Huntsville, Alabama 35807		Commander	
		USAF Environmental Technical	
Commander		Applications Center (MAC)	
US Naval Air Systems Command		ATTN: Mr. Oscar E. Richard	1
Washington, D.C. 20360	1	Box 825 Scott Air Force Base Illinois 62225	
Chief of Naval Research Department		beoutier refer base, minora oursa	
of the Navy		Headquarters	
Washington, D.C. 20360	1	Department of the Army	
		Directorate of Army Research	
Commander		ATTN: DAMA-ARZ	
US Naval Air Development Center		DAMA-ARZ-D	~
Warminster, Pennsylvania 18974	1	Dr. Frank D. Verderame	
		Washington, D.C. 20310	1
Commander			
Co Naval Electronics Lab Center		Dr. Robert J. Renard	1
san Diego, Cantornia 92152	1	Department of Meteorology	
and and an		Naval Postgraduate School	
Oninander		Monterey, California 93940	
Dahlaran Windala 20149			
Damgran, Virginia 22448	1	Dr. John J. DeLuisi NOAA/ERL-ARL	1
ElectroScience Laboratory		Boulder, Colorado 80303	
Department of Electrical Engineering			
The Ohio State University		Director	
ATTN: Dr. Ronald K. Long	1	US Army Night Vision Laboratory	
1320 Kinnear Road		ATTN: Mr. John Johnson	1
Columbus, Ohio 43212		Mr. Joseph R. Moulton	1
Commander		Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060	1
US Air Force, AFOSR/NP		Science and Technology Division	
ATTN: LT COL Gordon Wepfer	1	Institute for Defense Analyses	
Bolling Air Force Base		ATTN: Dr. Vincent J. Corcoran	1
Washington, D.C. 20332		Dr. Robert E. Roberts	1
		Dr. Lucien M. Biberman	1
Naval Surface		400 Army-Navy Drive	
Weapons Center		Arlington, Virginia 22202	
ATTN: Mary Tobin	1		
VR42		Director	
Vhite Oak, Maryland 20910		Naval Research Laboratory	
		ATTN: Code 5300, Radar Division	1
Pacific-Sierra Research Corporation		Code 5370, Radar Geophysics Branch	1
Man R. Shapiro	1	Code 5460, Electromagnetic Propagation	1
/ice President		Branch	
456 Cloverfield Boulevard		Washington, D.C. 20390	
anta Monica, California 90404			
		Florida State University	
		ATTN: Prof. Dr. Gleeson	1
		Prof. Dr. Craig	1
		Dept. of Meteorology Library	1
		Tallahassee, Florida 32306	

No. of

No. of Copies

	No. of Copies	
Air Force Cambridge Research		DRDMI-TKP, MI
Laboratories		-TL, Mr.
ATTN: OPI, Mr. John Selby	1	-TLD, MI
CRXL	1	-E, Mr. 1
LKI, Mr. Lund	1	-C
Mr. Gringorten	1	-CE, Mr.
Mr. Lenhard	1	-TB, Mr.
Mr. Grantham	1	-TBL
LYS, Mr. R. S. Hawkins	1	-TP, Mr.
Mr. V. Falcone	1	-TPR
LYW, Mrs. R. M. Dyer	1	-TR, Dr.
Mr. R. J. Donaldson	1	Dr.
LYP, Mr. B. A. Kunkel	1	Mrs
L. G. Hanscom Field		-TRA, Dr
Bedford, Massachusetts 01731		Dr
		Mr
Commander		Dr
US Army Electronics Command		Dr
ATTN: DRSEL-RD-SM, Mr. M. Lowenthal	1	Mr
-TL-1, Dr. Jacobs	1	-TRD, Mr
-CT, Dr. R. Buser	1	-TRO, Dr.
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703		Dr
		Dr
Commander		Mr
Naval Weapons Center		-TBD
ATTN: Code 3173, Dr. Alexis Shlanta	1	-TI (Reco
Mr. Robert Moore	1	(Refe
China Lake, California 93555		(Hore
Commander/Director		
Atmospheric Sciences Laboratory		
US Army Electronics Command		
ATTN: DRSEL-BL-DD. Mr. Bachele	3	
Dr. Mishri Vatsia	1	
Mr. James D	•	
Lindberg	,	
White Sands Missile Range, New	•	
New Mexico 88002		
Superior Technical Services, Inc.		
ATTN: D. Creel	1	
4308 Governors Drive		
Huntsville, Alabama 35802		
DRSMI-LP, Mr. Voigt	1	
DRCPM-LD	,	
-LD, COL J. H. Reeves	1	
DRDMI-X, Dr. McDaniel	1	
-XS, Dr. Hallowes	î	
-T. Dr. Kobler	1	
-H. Dr. Rose	i	
-TD. Dr. McCorkle	1	
Mr. Sullivan	1	
Mr. Conrad	1	
-TE, Mr. Lindberg	1	
Mr. Pittman	i	
-TG. Mr. Huff	1	
-TK	1	

	No. of
	Copies
MI-TKP, Mr. Duerr	
-TL. Mr. Lewis	
-TLD. Mr. Truman Gregg	1
-E. Mr. Northrop	1
-C	
-CE. Mr. S. L. Johnston	;
-TB. Mr. Clark	÷
-TBL	5
-TP, Mr. Bledsoe	1
-TPR	1
-TR, Dr. Hartman	1
Dr. Bennett	1
Mrs. Davis	3
-TRA, Dr. Essenwanger	1
Dr. Gibson	1
Mr. Dudel	1
Dr. Lilly	1
Dr. Stewart	50
Mrs. Boyd	1
-TRD, Mr. Shatas	1
-TRO, Dr. Stettler	1
Dr. Guenther	1
Dr. Gamble	1
Mr. Osmundsen	1
-TBD	3
-TI (Record Set)	1
(Reference Copy)	1