Developing Methods for Fractional Cover Estimation Toward Global Mapping of Ecosystem Composition

D.A. Roberts¹, David R. Thompson², P. E. Dennison³, R.O. Green², & R. Pavlick²

1) UCSB, Dept of Geography

 2) Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology
 3) Univ. Utah, Dept of Geography

Copyright 2016





Project Goals

- To Develop a Standard Fractional Cover Product for AVIRIS-C, AVIRIS-NG and future Global Missions
 - Green (Photosynthetic) Vegetation
 - Canopy Interception, Latent/sensible Heat Flux, Plant production, Carbon balance
 - Non-photosynthetic Vegetation
 - Plant residues, Resistance to erosion, Carbon balance
 - Substrate (S)
 - Soil: Soil degradation, Erosion potential
 - Ash/char: Burn products, Fire severity
 - Impervious: Roof, Roads, Urban energy balance, Transportation and runoff
 - Snow
 - Snow covered area, Water resources

The Team

- JPL: David Thompson, Robert Green, Ryan Pavlick, Natasha Stavros, Dave Schimel
 - Code development, spectral library development and validation subset of products
- UCSB: Dar Roberts, Zachary Tane
 - Spectral library development, GV, NPV, Impervious surfaces, soils
 - Fraction Validation
 - Impervious surface and GV cover, urban areas
 - NPV fractions, Sierra Nevada
- Univ. Utah Phil Dennison
 - Spectral library development, GV, NPV, soils
 - Product Validation
 - Soils and NPV

Complexity: 3,2,1 RGB Mixture Analysis (MESMA) Class (from model #) Composition: NPV-GV-Soil RGB



- Extension of Linear Spectral Mixture Analysis
- Allows the number and types of Endmembers to vary per pixel
 - Candidate models must meet fit and fraction constraints
- Models selected on minimum RMS
- Complexity level based on change in RMS

Why MESMA? Endmember Variability

- Endmember variability is a product:
 - Leaf level chemistry and anatomy (Asner)
 - Phenology
 - Architecture















Why MESMA? Dimensionality



How many Endmembers do you need?

Spectral Contrast: Ability to discriminate two or more materials based on significant spectral differences

Spectral Degeneracy: In ability to discriminate materials because they are either not spectrally distinct, or can be modeled as a combination of other endmembers

6

MESMA: The Good

- Urban Remote Sensing
 - Powell et al., 2007; Franke et al., 2009; Roberts et al., 2012; Demarchi et al., 2012; Okujeni et al., 2013; Fan and Deng, 2014
- Vegetation species, structure and disturbance
 - Dennison and Roberts, 2003a/b, Li et al., 2005; Sonnentag et al., 2007; Youngentob et al., 2011; Roth et al., 2012; Somers and Asner, 2013/2014; Antonrakis et al., 2014
- Wildfire, including Active Fires, Fuel Types, Fire Severity and Post-fire Recovery
 - Roberts et al., 2003; Dennison et al., 2006; Eckmann et al., 2008/2010; Veraverbeke et al., 2013; Quintano et al., 2013
- Arid Lands Remote Sensing
 - Okin et al., 2001; Ballantine et al., 2005; Thorp et al. 2013
- Snow-covered Area and Grain Size
 - Painter et al., 1998, 2003
- Coastal Marine/Kelp
 - Cavanaugh et al., 2011
- Environmental Damage by Mining
 - Fernandez-Manso et al., 2012
- Precision Agriculture
 - Tits et al., 2012
- Thermal Remote Sensing
 - Collins et al., 2001

An Example From Santa Barbara



- a) Modified VIS Model; b) NPV-GV-Soil
- c) Paved-Roof- Rock; c) Classification

Fractions Scale



Roberts et al., 2012

MESMA: The Bad

• Requires a Comprehensive Spectral Library

- Radiative Transfer: MEMSCAG
- Reference Polygons: AVIRIS as a source
- Field/laboratory Spectra: ASTER/USGS, Contributed
- Is Computationally Inefficient
 - Tries all possible combinations for all complexity levels
- Computationally Infeasible for Large Spectral Libraries
 - Endmembers in each category combine multiplicatively
 - 4 EM: 10 GV, 10, NPV, 10 Soil, 10 Impervious, 10 Ash = 7050 models



- Spectral Degeneracy
 - Endmembers that are distinct at 2 em, may have little impact on fractions at higher levels of complexity

MESMA: Reducing Complexity

Endmember Sub-selection

- Endmember Average RMS (EAR: Dennison and Roberts, 2003)
- Minimum Average Spectral Angle (MASA: Dennison et al., 2004)
- Count Based Endmember Selection (COB: Roberts et al., 2003)
- Iterative Endmember Selection (IES: Roth et al., 2012)





⁻ Stable Zone Unmixing (Somers et al., 2010)

$$EAR_{A_i,B} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n} RMSE_{A_i,B_j}}{n-1}$$

$$\operatorname{Min}_{\bar{\theta}_{A_{i},B}} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \theta_{A_{i},B_{j}}}{n-1}$$

Global MESMA: The Challenge

• What Spectral Library will be Used?

- Must be robust across multiple ecosystems/ecoregions
- Must be robust across multiple years and seasons
- Must include sufficient wavelengths (AVIRIS-C, AVIRIS-NG, ASD?)

• How will Spectral Libraries be Built?

- Integrated from Existing Libraries
 - Soils/Rocks (ASTER, USGS)
 - Snow (Radiative Transfer: Painter et al.)
 - NPV, Daughtry, Roberts, Dennison other
 - Impervious: Herold et al., 2004
 - Ash/Char: Veravebeke et al., 2013
- Reference Polygons
 - Compiled from multiple reference sets over source regions
- Image Derived?
 - e.g. PCOMMEND, SPICE, Other
- How will Computational Efficiency be Improved?
 - Fraction Retrieval: Thompson and the JPL Team
 - Endmember Reduction: Thompson and the JPL Team
- How will fractions be validated?
 - Existing validation data sets (GV, NPV, Impervious, Ash)
 - Synthetic Mixtures (NPV & Soils)

Implementation

- Fully implemented in the JPL Science Data System
 - Optimized to exploit multi-core parallelism
 - Automated into AVIRIS-NG and AVIRIS-C science workflows
 NPV PV Substrate





Spectrum reconstruction error

Permits user-tunable confidence filters

AVIRIS-NG RGB Image

Unmixing Result

RMSE



NPV PV Substrate

0..0 0.15

Building Spectral Libraries: Image Sources







Roberts et al., 2015

Building Spectral Libraries: Field Sources



Fraction Validation Strategy

- Existing high spatial resolution Fraction Reference sites
 - Urban: Roberts et al., 2012/2016
 - DOQQ
 - Sierra Nevada Forest Mortality
 - WV2 (Tane)
 - Other
 - Snow covered area products
 - Validated burned products
- Synthetic Mixtures
 NPV/Soil



Figure showing three validation polygons A: 44% NPV, 11.3% GV, 44.7% Soil B: 50.45%NPV, 1.5% GV, 48%Soil C: 4.8% NPV, 57.4% GV, 34.5% Soil, 3.3% Imp

Fraction Validation: Numerical Simulations (Dennison)

- 619 field spectra from agricultural (Daughtry) and rangeland (Kokaly) sites
- Each spectrum has field-assessed GV, NPV, and soil fractional cover
- Field spectra were used to model HyspIRI spectra, including noise, at 10, 15, 20, and 30 nm band spacing and FWHM
- Preliminary results show moderate correlations between fractions modeled by MESMA and field-assessed fractional cover
 - More effort is needed to improve endmember selection



Fraction Validation: Thompson Code

- Dennison simulated reflectance
- Indicates accuracy "sweet spot" at 10 Soil, NPV endmembers
- Spectral resolution to 30 nm is tolerable and may be preferable!



Summary

- Proposed development of a standard MESMA product from AVIRIS, AVIRIS-NG
- Requires comprehensive spectral libraries
 - Differing strategies are required for different materials
 - Will utilize different sources
- Will include extensive, targeted validation
- Key to success is identifying the minimum number of endmembers required to generate the highest accuracy
 - Reduces unnecessary run times
 - We need spectra that capture the variability for each category and no more