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Introduction

**Objectives**

To assess the relationship between optical properties and vegetation structure

To analyze the effect of vegetation structure in canopy spectra

To account for these effects to improve the estimation of leaf chemistry and structure from canopy spectra
OBJECTIVES

Main goal

To assess the relationship among structural metrics from LIDAR and optical spectral information from the Airborne Visible Infrared Imaging Spectrometer (AVIRIS)

Specific objectives:

1. Analyze the effect of stratification, by vegetation types, on the relationship among variables (Conifer versus Hardwood)

2. Identify the most significant region of the spectrum related to vegetation structure

3. Explore the best band combination indexes that show the strongest relationship with vegetation structure
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STUDY AREA: Soaproot Saddle

- Located in Central California
- Mid elevation (around 1100 m)
- Strong Mediterranean climate
- Hot, dry summers and mild, wet winters
- Mixed conifer/broadleaf forest:
  - Pinus ponderosa (ponderosa pine);
  - Quercus kelloggii (black oak);
  - Quercus chrysolepis (canyon live oak)
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Material and Methods

AVIRIS DATA:

- Surface reflectance
- Spatial resolution: 18 m
- Spectral resolution: 224 bands (350-2500nm)
- Acquisition date: June-2013

NEON LIDAR DATA:

- Point density: 1.7 ppm2
- Small - footprint
- Multi return
- Acquisition date: June-2013
**LIDAR VARIABLES**

1. **Height related variables:** Height max ($H_{\text{max}}$), Height mean ($H_{\text{mean}}$), Height median ($H_{\text{median}}$), Height standard deviation ($H_{\text{std}}$), Canopy Height Model standard deviation (CHM)

2. **Biomass related variables:** Leaf Area Index (LAI), Fractional Canopy Cover (FC), Fractional Canopy cover from 1st return (FC_1ret), Vegetation Vertical Profile integral (VVP)
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AVIRIS DATA

Pre-processing data:
- Sun Canopy Sensor correction → remove topography effects
- Textural analysis → Study area stratification

Variables selection:
- Multiple endmember spectral mixture analysis (MESMA)
  → GV, NPV, soil, Shade fraction
- Optical indices and spectral figures
  → NDVI, NDVI705, mNDVI705, EVI
  → NDWI, NDII
  → EWT, CAI
  → Wtr1EdgeWvl, Wtr2EdgeWvl, Wtr1EdgeMag, Wtr2EdgeMag, Wtr1AbAr, Wtr2AbAr
### RESULTS

**INTERCORRELATED LIDAR VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LAI</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>FC_1ret</th>
<th>VVP</th>
<th>H_max</th>
<th>H_mean</th>
<th>H_median</th>
<th>H_std</th>
<th>CHM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAI</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC_1ret</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVP</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H_max</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H_mean</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.99</strong></td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H_median</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td><strong>0.99</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H_std</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.95</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHM</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td><strong>0.95</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Green Biomass**  **Height**  **Complexity**
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## Results

### Relationship Optical Variables and Green Biomass

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Pixels</th>
<th>Conifer</th>
<th>Hardwood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Pixels</strong></td>
<td>Wtr2AbAr (0.46)</td>
<td>Wtr2AbAr (0.43)</td>
<td>CAI (0.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homogeneous</strong></td>
<td>NDVI 705 (0.41)</td>
<td>NDII (0.59)</td>
<td>Wtr2AbAr (0.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heterogeneous</strong></td>
<td>Wtr2AbAr (0.48)</td>
<td>Wtr2AbAr (0.45)</td>
<td>NDVI 705 (0.55)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Stratification by vegetation types and spectral homogeneity may improve the correlations.
- Water dependent indexes, NDII and CAI have highest correlation in homogeneous conifer and in hardwood forest respectively.
- Water absorption feature indexes show acceptable correlations in most scenarios.
RESULTS

RELATIONSHIP OPTICAL VARIABLES AND HEIGHT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL PIXELS</th>
<th>CONIFER</th>
<th>HARDWOOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL PIXELS</td>
<td>SHADE (0.29)</td>
<td>GV (0.34)</td>
<td>NULL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOMOGENEOUS</td>
<td>SHADE (0.21)</td>
<td>SHADE (0.14)</td>
<td>mNDVI705 (0.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HETEROGENEOUS</td>
<td>SHADE (0.29)</td>
<td>GV/SHADE (0.26)</td>
<td>SHADE (0.32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Stratification by vegetation types and spectral homogeneity may improve correlations
- Shade fraction has the highest correlation in most scenarios
- Discrimination by spectral homogeneity improves correlations in hardwood forests
# RESULTS

## RELATIONSHIP OPTICAL VARIABLES AND COMPLEXITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL PIXELS</th>
<th>CONIFER</th>
<th>HARDWOOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL PIXELS</strong></td>
<td>SHADE (0.35)</td>
<td>SHADE (0.39)</td>
<td>NULL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOMOGENEOUS</strong></td>
<td>SHADE (0.20)</td>
<td>SHADE (0.25)</td>
<td>mNDVI705 (0.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HETEROGENEOUS</strong></td>
<td>SHADE (0.40)</td>
<td>SHADE (0.31)</td>
<td>SHADE (0.34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Stratification by vegetation types and spectral homogeneity may improve correlations
- Shade fraction has highest correlation in most scenarios
- Discrimination by spectral homogeneity improves correlations in hardwood forests

---
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• Correlations change with vegetation type across the spectrum
• Green Biomass in Conifer forests is related to reflectance in the visible and SWIR parts of the spectrum, while in hardwood forest the NIR also has acceptable correlations
RESULTS

RELATIONSHIP SPECTRAL BANDS AND HEIGHT

- Correlations change with vegetation type across the spectrum
- The visible and NIR part of the spectrum have highest correlations with height in Conifer forests
- Hardwood forests lack a clear part of the spectrum with high correlations with height
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**RESULTS**

**RELATIONSHIP SPECTRAL BANDS AND COMPLEXITY**

- No part of the spectrum had high correlations with complexity.
- The highest correlations are found in conifer forest.
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- The best band combination is in NIR and SWIR parts of the spectrum
The best band combination is around bands 733-791 nm

The combination of NIR and SWIR regions also show acceptable correlations
**INDEX OPTIMIZATION - GREEN BIOMASS (HARDWOOD)**

- The best band combination is in the visible and SWIR part of the spectrum
- NIR in combination with SWIR region also show satisfactory correlations

\[
I_{b\_har} = \frac{\rho_{569} - \rho_{2425}}{\rho_{569} + \rho_{2425}}
\]

\[R^2 = 0.68\]
There is no part of the spectrum that shows high correlations. The best band combination is around bands 1100 nm. Also, the combination of bands around 600 nm presents appreciable correlations.
**RESULTS**

**INDEX OPTIMIZATION – HEIGHT (CONIFER)**

- The best band combination is in the SWIR part of the spectrum
- The combination of bands around 1100 nm shows acceptable correlations

\[
I_{h\_con} = \frac{\rho_{540} - \rho_{1800}}{\rho_{540} + \rho_{1800}}
\]

\[R^2 = 0.34\]
The best band combination is in the visible and NIR part of the spectrum specially using bands situated around 600 nm
**RESULTS**

**INDEX OPTIMIZATION – COMPLEXITY (ALL)**

- The best band combination is around band 1100 coincident with a water absorption feature

$R^2 = 0.30$

$Ic_{\text{all}} = \frac{\rho_{1205} - \rho_{1215}}{\rho_{1205} + \rho_{1215}}$
• The best band combination is around band 1100 coincident with a water absorption feature
• The best band combination is with bands 375 and 713 nm
• The region between 1482 and 1966 nm also present acceptable correlations

\[ Ic_{-har} = \frac{\rho_{375} - \rho_{713}}{\rho_{375} + \rho_{713}} \]

\[ R^2 = 0.36 \]
Conclusions

1. Stratification by vegetation type (conifer versus hardwood) allow obtaining stronger relationship between vegetation structure and optical metrics.

2. The optical metric most strongly correlated with height and complexity is the shade fraction.

3. The optical metric most strongly correlated with green biomass is a water absorption features (Wtr2AbAr).

4. The regions of the spectrum more correlated with vegetation structure present differences between conifer and hardwood forest probably due to the high dissimilarity between this two types of forest in terms of vegetation structure.
5. The best band combination indices improve the correlations in all of the studied scenarios.

6. Results show the potential of imaging spectroscopy to evaluate the relationship between optical properties and vegetation structure.

7. Future research will investigate how to use these optical metrics to quantify the effect of the vegetation structure in the canopy spectra to improve the estimation of leaf properties within imaging spectroscopy data.
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