Atmospheric Monitoring for Ground-Based Astroparticle Detectors





Martin Will Instituto de Astrofísica de Canarias (IAC)

Detection Principle



Detection Principle

p, γ

Development of Air Shower depends on density profile

$$\rho_{air} = \frac{m_{air}}{V} = \frac{p \cdot M_{air}}{R \ T}$$

Interactions with Atmosphere

cause emission of photons (Fluorescence and Cherenkov)

Detection Principle



Atmospheric Monitoring

Fluorescence Light



Radiative transitions to lower states

 \rightarrow Isotropic emission of UV fluorescence light

Non-radiative transition through collisions with (water) molecules
 → Vapor quenching

Fluorescence Yield

$$\frac{dN_{\gamma}}{dX} = \frac{dE_{dep}^{tot}}{dX} \int FY(\lambda, p, T, e) \cdot \tau_{atm}(\lambda, p, T, e) \cdot \epsilon_{FD}(\lambda) d\lambda$$

Reduction of emitted light due to humidity up to 7 km a.s.l.

- Reconstructed energy without consideration of humidity too low
- Small change in shower maximum (dependent on zenith angle)





Martin Will

Atmospheric Monitoring

Scattering



Molecular Atmosphere

Effect on produced light

- Shower development depends on density
- Number of Cherenkov photons, Cherenkov threshold
- Fluorescence Yield
- Transmission to detector

$$I_{det} \propto I_{emit} \cdot T_{mol} \cdot T_{aer}$$

Reconstructed energy scales with optical transmission

Molecular Atmosphere



Weather Balloon



Weather Station

- Ground Measurements
 - ► Temperature
 - Pressure
 - Relative humidity
 - Wind speed and direction





Atmospheric Monitoring

Global Data Assimilation System



- Global measurements and numerical weather prediction
- GDAS data available
 - for whole earth
 - 1° grid (180° x 360°)
 - every 3 hours



Comparison with balloon data validates GDAS for Auger site

Atmospheric Monitoring

GDAS Advantages



Improved systematic uncertainty compared to other models

Replacement for balloon launches

 \rightarrow Save money for equipment and personnel

GDAS in La Palma





- Agreement in pressure
- Sys. offset in temperature (~ 2°C ground effects)
- Humidity very dependent on location
- Cheap and reliable data source for CTA





- Aerosol enhancements close to ground and clouds
- Highly variable in altitude and time, scale of hours
- Transmission to detector

$$I_{det} \propto I_{emit} \cdot T_{mol} \cdot T_{aer}$$

Strong energy dependence on cloud height



Aerosol Transmission and Clouds

$$I_{det} \propto I_{emit} \cdot T_{mol} \cdot T_{aer}$$

- Measuring instrument: LIDAR
- Light Detection and Ranging ("Light Radar")
- Different kind of LIDARs
 - Wavelength of scattered light (scatter center, scattering process)
 - Location of laser and detector (collocated or separated)
 - Each with advantages and disadvantages

Theory: Elastic LIDAR



Aerosol backscattering unknown

- Size and number of aerosols unknown
- Need assumptions or scanning



Theory: Raman LIDAR



- Nitrogen backscattering
 - Number density known
 - Low Raman cross section
 - Large amount of light needed



Raman LIDAR

R&D system
 commissioned
 in SE Colorado







Raman LIDAR Data





Atmospheric Monitoring

Theory: Bi-static LIDAR





Nd:YAG 355 nm 5–10 mJ



Martin Will

Bi-static LIDAR (Receiver)

- 4 vertical columns, 16 PMTs each
- 1° FoV per pixel (old HiRes-II camera)
- UV bandpass filter





- Main assumptions
 - Reference night clear of aerosols
 - Scattering out of beam is dominated by Rayleigh scattering
 - Atmosphere horizontally uniform between laser and FD





Atmospheric Monitoring

Bi-static LIDAR Data



Martin Will

Atmospheric Monitoring

Comparison Raman / Bi-static



Raman / Bi-static LIDAR at Auger





CTA Raman LIDAR



- Upgrade of Colorado system
 - Continue measurements
 - Characterize site
- Integrate into CTA
 - Move to La Palma 2017
 - Later to southern site
- Minimize impact on CTA measurements





Martin Will

Atmospheric Monitoring

FRAM (Fotometric Robotic telescope for Atmospheric Monitoring)

Passive measurement

- Stellar photometry
- 15°×15° FoV, several 100 stars
- Integral extinction
- 10 years experience from Auger

FRAM for CTA

- Prototype deployment in La Palma
- Aerosol maps in fixed FoV
- Altitude scans for aerosol profiles
- 11 inch MPI telescope for MAGIC
 - Similar characteristics, spectrograph
 - Transmission from spectrum differences of stars
 - Deployed in La Palma before FRAM





CTA AllSky Camera

AllSky camera on MAGIC counting house roof

- Czech construction (also used at Auger)
- 3 different filters (plus no filter)
- ► 60 seconds exposure





Cloud Detection

Star detection with image filter



Atmospheric Monitoring

Cloud Detection

Star detection with image filter



Atmospheric Monitoring

- Identify single clusters in cloud maps
- Compare position of clusters between images
- Difference is direction movement of clouds



- Identify single clusters in cloud maps
- Compare position of clusters between images
- Difference is direction movement of clouds



- Identify single clusters in cloud maps
- Compare position of clusters between images
- Difference is direction movement of clouds



- Identify single clusters in cloud maps
- Compare position of clusters between images
- Difference is direction movement of clouds
- Potential problems
 - Clouds can change shape
 - Clouds can split or merge
 - Clouds can disappear
- Further improvement
 - Wind speed from GDAS
 - Cloud properties from LIDAR



CTA Air Shower Simulations

Systematic uncertainties in CTA must not exceed 10%

- MAGIC: 11% due to atmosphere
- Auger: 6–7% due to atmosphere (14% total)
- Simulated response functions
 - Need input from atmospheric measurement instruments
 - Fast for online analysis
 - Reliable and precise for offline analysis
- Instrumentation at Northern CTA site
 - Weather stations, wind sensors, rain sensors, …
 - Dust counters, electric field mill, …
 - LIDARs, FRAM, ...

Summary

Atmospheric parameters influence air shower detection

- Density profile influences development
- Cherenkov and fluorescence light production
- Transmission depends on molecular and aerosol scattering

Measurement of atmospheric parameters

- Balloons, weather stations, model data for profiles
- LIDARs and passive photometry for transmission
- Cloud detection using AllSky cameras

Apply lessons learned for CTA

- Combination of instruments to keep sys. uncertainties at 10%
- New models and unexplored sources for atmospheric data

GDAS Data Comparison



Atmospheric Monitoring

Other Data Sources

20:01 UT	Temp. °C	Hum. %	Wspd km/h	Wdir dir.	Press.	See.*			
LT	17.1	9	5.3	NW	779.0				
MT	16.9	9	6.1	NW	778.3				
INT	16.1	9	10.4	WNW	779.6				
JKT	16.4	9	9.4	WNW	776.8				
SWASP	16.6	9	5.0	NNW	761.6				
WHT	16.4	7	0.0	WNW	779.9	n.a.			
NOT	14.2	3	9.3	W	774.4				
TNG	16.7	8	6.4	N	776.6	0.6			
GTC	17.2	7	2.2	ENE	782.4				
IAC	I	PWV ((mm):	7.0	MORADAS	0.9			
MAGIC	15.8	11	4.0	SE	790.7				
: WHT, TNG, MORADAS									

- Other ORM telescopes
 - Weather station data
 - Seeing
 - Dust concentration



- Dust measurement at TNG
 - Automatic particle counter Lasair II 310B
 - Particle concentration from laser scattering
 - Size sensitivity
 0.3, 0.5, 1.0, 3.0, 5.0, 10.0 µm
 - 2h cumulative density in µg/m³



Satellite Data and Forecasts

Data available for La Palma site

- Weather forecasts
- Cloud satellite images
- Aerosol optical depth forecast

EUMETSAT Cloud Image



EUMETSAT Top Height 2016-09-08 07:30:00 UT

SKIRON AOD Forecast Aerosol Optical Depth at 550 nm Sat 10.09.16 at 18 UC

Roque de los Muchachos Mountain Forecast

	6 22	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	483	0	0		C	0	999 1977
Wind (km/h)	5	0	0	6	10,	0	0	0	₫	₽	5	ወ	ወ	0	₽	20	20	20
Summary	rain shwrs	clear	rain shwrs	clear	clear	clear	rain shwrs	clear	rain shwrs									
Snow (cm)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rain (mm)	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1
High °C	16	16	16	15	14	14	13	12	12	11	11	11	10	11	11	12	12	12
Low °C	16	16	15	15	14	13	12	12	10	11	10	10	10	11	11	11	12	11
Chill °C	16	16	15	14	13	14	12	11	10	9	10	10	9	10	9	10	10	10
Freezing level (m)	4800	4900	4850	4750	4800	4700	4650	4650	4600	4500	4450	4450	4400	4450	4450	4550	4650	4700

Atmospheric Monitoring

Star Detection

- Blob detection with image filter
 - Applied to each pixel
 - Summing up all neighbor pixels
 - Filter mask as weight matrix
 - Returned value is filter response
- Chosen filter: Laplacian of Gaussian (LoG)
 - Reduce noise by smoothing with Gaussian
 - Laplacian filter: adjustable blob size, rotation invariant, fast computing speed, insensitive to linear brightness gradients
- Apply kernel for each star in catalog
 - Avoid hot pixels
 - Chose magnitude limit
- Take into account exposure, atm. absorption, lens distortions





Energy Threshold



Raman LIDAR









