# Optista lentokonekaukokartoitusta Hyytiälän metsissä ja soilla 1997–2011

Ilkka Korpela (UH, EUF) - FGI March 22, 2011













PERS 3/2011

## Hyytiälä

Forest field station of UH, 1910– (2010- Dept. of Forest Sciences)

130-200 m a.s.l.

EFTP 60, EFJY 100, EFHF 200 km

#### Field teaching:

forestry, environmental sciences, metheorology (physics).

#### **Research:**

SMEAR II (Sunphotometer, etc.) Peatlands Optical RS (forestry + theoretical RS)

State-owned land (mostly). Experimentation possible.





# Hyytiälä







**Remote Sensing in Forestry** 

### Forest inventory and monitoring in a nutshell



# Some (inaccurate) Historical Notes



(1946) First aerial image block from Hyytiälä

- Aerial photo interpretation for forestry since 1930s
- CIR film in Finland 1975  $\Rightarrow$
- Digital orthoimages ~1995 ⇒ (non-stereo intrepretation)
- First trials with satellite images since early 1970s (multi-stage/phase sampling)
- National Forest Inventory adopted sat. images for coarse generalization (1980s, 1990s)
- Digital photogrammetry & LiDAR surfing (2000–)

Some early names in Finland:

Aarne Nyyssönen, Simo Poso, Kunnallistekniikka, Risto Kuittinen, VTT, Tuomas Häme, ... Airborne Remote Sensing Activities in Hyytiälä 1997– Empirical Research "Making implications of X in population Y through observations "

### **Method Development**

### "Assuring that developed solution is robust"





Keywords:

Good Observations, Representative sampling, Controlled effects, Big N and redundancy, Consortia, Sharing.

# Network of permanent forest plots (1994-)

\* efficient "photogrammetric-geodetic" tree mapping method applied since 2006.







1985 1:10000 CIR



# High geometric reliability over time – ground truth,

images & LiDAR



## LiDAR 2004-

Set	Date	Sensor	Over- lap %	Scan angle	Pulse density	PRF, kHz
2004-1km	5.8.	ALTM1233	25%	±15°	1-3	33
2006-1km	25.7.	ALTM3100	55%	±14°	6-8	100
2007-1km	4.7.	ALS-50	55%	±15°	6-10	116
2008-1km	23.8.	ALS-50	30%	±32°	2.7	-
2008-2km	23.8.	ALS-50	30%	±32°	1.6	-
2008-3km	23.8.	ALS-50	30%	±32°	0.5	-
2008-4km	23.8.	ALS-50	30%	±32°	0.2	-
2010-1.2km	19.7.	ALS-60 1-nsec	60%	±15°	8	174
2010-2km	19.7.	ALS-60 1-nsec	30%	±15°	2	-
2010-2km	19.7.	ALS-60 2-nsec	30%	±15°	2	-
2010-3km	19.7.	ALS-60 1-nsec	30%	±15°	1	-
2010-3km	19.7.	ALS-60 2-nsec	30%	±15°	1	-





### 1997-2004

# Digital aerial images and digital photogrammetry.

1989 Hannu Salmenperä had written a DPW in C together with Prof. Poso. "YPNIT".

- binary scanning (20 MB HDD) of 9"×9" film for IO
- sub-image scanning for EO  $\Rightarrow$  "Piecewise fotogrammetry?"

In Austria Axel Pinz, in Denmark Kim Dralle – monoscopic crown detection in scanned film images. Mats Eriksson in Sweden.

In Canada F. Cougeon (MEIS sensors)





### 1997-2004

Digital aerial images and digital photogrammetry.

#### Single-tree photogrammetry tried

in digital images (not novel as such, e.g. Nyyssönen 1955, Juri Talts 1977)

Many worked with near-nadir or very-high resolution data, which of course is not feasible.

#### **Area-based estimatation**

Texture-features for "areas" were tried (cf. area-based LiDAR features).



Scanned film artifacts

#### Lessons learned (in Hyytiälä):

Occlusion and shading are inherent properties

Tree crowns are not 2D



Lessons learned (in Hyytiälä):

Occlusion and shading are inherent properties

Tree crowns are not 2D

INT. J. RS (2004)

Monoscopic crown detection in off-nadir ( $\theta_v \sim 35^\circ$ ) front-lit ( $\phi_{s,v} \sim 180^\circ$  image data (14 um scanning, 1:20000 CIR film)



#### PJF (2004)

"Trees are such 3D creatures that feature/area-based image-matching fails"



#### Silva Fennica 2004, PFG 2007

#### Single-tree RS

"Trees are such 3D creatures that feature-based matching + constraining are required





## LiDAR over Hyytiälä 2004 –

From image-matching viewpoint (LiDAR is):

Short-cut to geometric constraining
Great, since it sees the ground!



# LiDAR activity in Hyytiälä (2004-)

- Multitemporal time-series of aerial photos & LiDAR
- Co-use LiDAR & images in 3D tree top positioning
- DEM accuracy of leaf-on data
- Discrete-return data in tree crown shape reconstruction (links to canopy shape and illumination conditions modeling for image analysis of reflectance calibrated ADS40 images) \*).
- Intensity data in tree species classification \*)
- Range and AGC normalization of intensity data \*)
- Single-tree remote sensing
- Mire habitat characterization
- LAI and canopy cover estimation. Ground-lichen mapping.
- Modeling transmission losses in intensity data
- Understory tree mapping. Change detection (snow breaks), Tree growth
- Waveform data: transmission losses, tree species, seedling stnds, DEM-estimation \*)

\*) with FGI

Some pics from most interesting findings

# Ambiguity of intensity range normalization in forest canopies



$$_{\rm corr} = I_{\rm raw} \times (R/R_{\rm ref})^{\rm a}$$

# Reverse-engineering the LEICA ALS5/6# agc-circuit (2007-)



# Making RF decision tree to deduce mire characteristics from area-based features





# Making echo #2, #3 and #4 intensity data (in the understory) more usable

- With Felix Morsdorf, LSR Zurich

- Invisible losses (Below SNR) ~ *f* (geometry)
- Blind zone / extended echoes ~ f (geometry)
- Previous echoes

E.g. echo #2 raw intensity data has 70% CV per species, after model correction, 48%. Echo #1 raw intensity data ~40%.



# Detection of Snow Breaks in bi-temporal LiDAR data









Another

**Photon** 

Source

Target



Lidar



# Outlook

#### ASR-calibrated aerial images are coming:

- Within-block modeling / normalization for the BRDF (and atmospheric) effects
- Reflectance calibration can it ever be accurate enough to e.g. make model inversion (theoretical RS) feasible (or campaign-to-campaign calibration for that matter)?
- RGBN + red-edge (700-nm) cameras, shoud more effort be put to defining optimal radiometric sampling?
- Even if reflectance or at-sensor radiance observations are perfect, trees exhibit extreme within-class variation (due to structure, bk-gnd)

#### Waveform-sampling pulsed LiDAR systems

- 4-9-ns waves sttill restrict the level-of-detail that can be reconstructed from the returning waveforms.
- Low vegetation & DEM estimation is the gain enough to pay the costs of data storage and analysis.
- On-the-fly feature extraction (waveform not saved) should be strived for.

# **THANK YOU!**



Ilkka Korpela, b. 1968. University Lecturer (Forest Information Systems)

MSc 1993 - UH. Thesis: "Forest Grrowth Study in the Vicinity of a Petrochemical Complex"

PhD 2004 – UH. Thesis: "Individual Tree Measurements by Means of Digital Aerial Photogrammetry".

Yrjö Ilvessalo Prize 2004.

Hansa Luftbild Award 2008.

**Elmers**: Risto Ojansuu, Helena Henttonen, Simo Poso, Aarne Nyyssönen, Keijo Inkilä, Jan Heikkilä, Pekka Savolainen, Timo Tokola, Annika Kangas, Ulrich Beisl,..



"Guru" - Dr. Ulrich Beisl – Leica Geosystems' Sensor Engineer.



Prof. emeritus Simo Poso – He presented the sampling and estimation techniques used currently in LiDAR inventories. Simo used aerial & satellite photos.