NOAA Technical Report NESDIS 54

# EVALUATION OF DATA REDUCTION AND COMPOSITING OF THE NOAA GLOBAL VEGETATION INDEX PRODUCT: A CASE STUDY

Washington, D.C.
July 1990





U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service

# NOAA Technical Report NESDIS 54

# EVALUATION OF DATA REDUCTION AND COMPOSITING OF THE NOAA GLOBAL VEGETATION INDEX PRODUCT: A CASE STUDY


K. P. Gallo
Office of Research and Application
Land Sciences Branch
EROS Data Center
Sioux Falls, SD

and

J. F. Brown
University of Nebraska
CALMIT/Geography Department
Lincoln, NE





Washington, D.C.
July 1990

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**
**Robert A. Mosbacher, Secretary**

**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**
John A. Knauss, Under Secretary

National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service
Thomas N. Pyke, Jr. , Assistant Administrator

ABSTRACT. Data acquired by the Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer (AVHRR) onboard the TIROS/NOAA series of satellites are spatially degraded from a 1 km resolution at nadir (LAC) to several coarser resolutions. Global Area Coverage (GAC) data are processed onboard the satellites and have a resolution of approximately 4 km. Global Vegetation Index (GVI) data are processed from sampled GAC data and have a resolution of approximately 15 km. The objectives of this study were to examine the effects of spatial degradation of NOAA AVHRR data on monitoring of land surface or related processes over large areas and to examine alternative procedures for computation and compositing of the GVI data product. (over)

Comparisons of county and climatic division averages of the various resolutions of vegetation index data indicated that differences existed between the examined resolutions and sampling algorithms included in this study. A portion of the observed differences, however, was not due to the data reduction algorithms utilized but to shifts in county and climatic division boundaries as a result of the mean values of the vegetation index computed for the counties with the GAC data. The average difference between an ND value computed for a county at GAC and LAC resolutions was usually less than 0.01. Similarly, the GVI1 (current single GAC sample algorithm), GVI2 (modified average of all GAC samples algorithm), and GAC data provided essentially the same mean vegetation index values as LAC for the examined climatic division.

Vegetation index (VI) data derived for the climatic divisions computed with the GVI1 algorithm were more representative of the LAC and GAC data than were the VI data computed with the GVI2 algorithm. The range and distribution of the GVI1 data were more similar to that of the LAC and GAC data than were the GVI2 data. Thus, the results of this study suggest that NOAA continues to use the current algorithm for data reduction of the GVI product rather than an average of all GAC samples within a GVI pixel.

Evaluation of the weekly composite process supports previous research that observed a systematic bias in the scan angles of the satellite selected for the weekly composite due to the current (difference vegetation index) composite algorithm. Zenith angles selected by the present and modified (normalized difference) composite algorithms differed for greater than half of the observed weeks for the twelve sites examined in this study. The similarity of zenith angle selection by the two examined algorithms was as great

as 80% for the 10 composite weeks examined. The similarity of selected angles was as low as 20% of those weeks evaluated. Zenith angles in the backscatter direction were favored by the difference index algorithm compared to the normalized difference index, which appeared to favor selection of zenith angles in the forward scatter direction.

In summary, differences existed between the vegetation index values computed for the examined data resolutions, ~~however,~~ a portion of the observed difference was not due directly to reduction of the satellite data. The mean values of the low resolution (GAC or GVI) data were representative of the full resolution data. Thus, low resolution data ~~utilized~~ used in monitoring activities would likely provide the same results as full resolution data (LAC). The difference index would be the recommended algorithm for satellite zenith angle selection if advantages exist for selection of backscatter views of vegetation from satellites.

# I. INTRODUCTION

## Data Reduction

Current and future data derived from satellite platforms will be available at a variety of spatial, temporal, and spectral resolutions. The amount of data available to researchers is often more than required or can be utilized and thus, data reduction algorithms are applied. Temporal degradation includes weekly or greater composites of daily data (e.g., Tarpley et al., 1984). Spectral degradation includes combinations of two or more wavebands into fewer bands of data (e.g., normalized difference or greenness vegetation indices; Perry and Lautenschlager, 1984). Spatial degradation includes spatial averaging or sample selection that reduces the amount and resolution of the data over an area.

Visible (0.58 - 0.68 µm) and near-IR (0.72 - 1.0 µm) data acquired by the Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer (AVHRR) on board the TIROS/NOAA series of satellites are spatially degraded from the 1 km resolution at nadir to several courser resolutions. Global Area Coverage (GAC) data (Kidwell, 1986) are processed on board the satellite and have a resolution of approximately 4 km. Global Vegetation Index (GVI) data (Kidwell, 1990) are processed from GAC data that have been transmitted to Earth and have a resolution of approximately 15 km.

The often overwhelming amount of data available for large-area monitoring of land surface processes often leads to the use of spatially degraded data (i.e., NOAA's GAC or GVI data). Additionally, there are applications of remotely sensed data that require multitemporal sampling within specific geographic or political boundaries for monitoring of a land surface or related process. Eidenshink et al. (1989) utilized 1 km AVHRR data averaged within U.S. county boundaries for applications in fire-fuel models. Gallo and Flesch (1989) utilized NOAA GVI data averaged within U.S. crop Reporting Districts for comparison with crop phenology. Gallo and Heddinghaus (1989) also utilized NOAA GVI data, averaged within U.S. Climatic Divisions for comparison with weekly climatic data. Global climatic models require data averaged over areas defined by several degrees of latitude and longitude (e.g., $4.5^{\circ}$ by $7.5^{\circ}$ for NCAR Global Community Model; Dickinson et al., 1986).

The spatial degradation of data from the Landsat Multispectral Scanner (MSS) resolution of 79 m to the NOAA AVHRR 1 and 4 km resolutions has been examined for specific land surface areas for single (Justice et al., 1989) and multiple dates (Townshend and Justice, 1988). Justice et al., (1989) also examined alternative methods to NOAA's current processing of 1 km data to GAC resolution. Generally, within each study, a decreased variability in vegetation index values was observed as spatial resolution decreased. Analysis by Justice et al. (1989), of spatially degraded data for Superior National Forest in Minnesota, indicated an increase of the normalized difference vegetation index (ND) of 5.8% as spatial resolution was degraded from 0.083 to 4 km. This increase could be attributed to the lack of detection of small lakes (ND values of zero or less) at the 4 km compared to .083 km resolution data. Spatial degradation from 0.5 or 1 km to 4 km only increased ND by 0.9 and 0.5% respectively. These results, as well as the positive results observed in applications of the data (e.g. Gallo and Flesch, 1989) suggest that reduced resolution data may be adequate for land process applications over large areas.

Data Compositing

The scanning characteristics of the AVHRR present a capability for monitoring large areas (swath width approximately 2400 km), however, the zenith angles associated with the wide view result in a sensor view of the earth while orientated towards (forward view) and away (backward view) from the sun. Data presented in an analysis of 40 km resolution visible and near-IR AVHRR data (Gutman, 1987) indicated that the current GVI compositing algorithm may systematically bias (in favor of backward views) the solar zenith angle selection associated with the weekly composited visible, near-IR and vegetation index data. The current method of mapping daily GAC data to the GVI grid may also bias the zenith angle selection. The last GAC sample that is mapped to a GVI pixel is retained on a daily basis (Kidwell, 1990). Due to this mapping process, a specific surface location observed in two successive orbits would have data retained from the second (more backward) view of the surface.

The objectives of this study were to examine the effects of spatial degradation of NOAA AVHRR data on monitoring of land surface or related processes over large areas. Secondary objectives included examination of the GVI data sampling and compositing procedures. While GAC processing occurs on board the satellite, GVI processing occurs at a NESDIS facility in suburban Washington D.C. and can be modified. A second data reduction procedure for GVI data was evaluated for the GVI data and compared to 1 km, 4 km (GAC), and current GVI vegetation index data. Two vegetation index composite algorithms were evaluated with 1 km resolution data for satellite zenith angle selection differences.

## II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Data Reduction

Weekly 1 km (LAC) resolution composites of the normalized difference vegetation index (ND = (near-IR - visible)/(near-IR + visible)) derived from calibrated NOAA AVHRR reflectance data (Eidenshink et al., 1988) were resampled to produce GAC and GVI resolution data sets. A GAC pixel is the average derived from a one by four pixel sample of LAC pixels. One sample is skipped per row of data between computation of each GAC pixel. Additionally, two rows of data are skipped (Figure 1a) before continued computation of GAC pixels (Kidwell, 1986; Kidwell, 1990) Thus, each GAC pixel represents a 3 by 5 km region (at nadir) although the data are derived from a 1 by 4 km area.

Justice et al. (1989) observed that the ND computed for a GAC pixel from the ND values of LAC pixels may differ from a GAC ND value computed from GAC pixels of visible and near-IR data (i.e. visible and near-IR averaged over the four LAC pixels prior to computation of ND). NOAA computes GAC data on board the satellite, thus, GAC visible and near-IR data are utilized in computation of the ND at the GVI resolution. A comparison of the ND values computed with the two methods of GAC computation (average ND over 4 pixels or average visible and near-IR with subsequent computation of ND) for one composite week of our data revealed little difference between the two methods. The ND values of the GAC resolution data computed with both methods were identical for greater than 30% of the pixels in our study area (total 118,827 GAC pixels). Greater than 90% of the pixels displayed a difference less than +/- 0.02 (ND data on a scale of -1.00 to 1.00). The GAC ND values of this study were computed as the average of the ND values of four LAC pixels as this method saved computational time and presented little difference from the alternative method.

GVI data processed by NOAA (Kidwell, 1990) consist of GAC resolution data that are mapped to a GVI pixel (aerial coverage approximately 15 by 15 km). The data of the last GAC pixel mapped to a GVI pixel are retained each day. Thus, the data of the GVI pixel are derived from a single sample of those GAC pixels within the GVI pixel area (Figure 1). This study included the NOAA GVI computational procedure (GVI1) and a second method of computation of GVI pixels (GVI2). The GVI2 sample was computed as the mean value of all GAC pixels (15 utilized in this study) within the GVI coverage area.

The region included in the composite data was the Northern Great Plains of the United States (approximately 37 to 50 $^{o}$N and 94 to 108 $^{o}$W). The study area includes a wide variety of land surface features. Agricultural areas within the study region include land planted with corn, soybeans, wheat, and sorghum. Grasslands, forests, lakes, rivers, urban areas, and a portion of the Rocky Mountains are all included in the region.

Briefly, from 29 March through 31 October 1988 NOAA-AVHRR data were acquired by a reception station at the U.S. Geological Survey's EROS Data Center in Sioux Falls, SD. Daily data for the Northern Great Plains were visually screened and scenes that were primarily cloudless within the region were retained for a weekly composite. This composite product was based on the daily normalized difference vegetation index (ND) values;

$$\text{ND} = (\text{near-IR} - \text{visible})/(\text{near-IR} + \text{visible}),$$

such that for each pixel the data associated with the maximum ND value was retained in the weekly composite. This composite differs from the NOAA/NESDIS GVI composite procedure as the retained data of that product are based on the daily difference index;

$$\text{Difference index} = (\text{near-IR} - \text{visible}).$$

Data reduction analyses utilized the weekly composites based on ND as these data were readily available and not expected to affect the results of comparisons of different data resolutions.

Five weeks of the weekly ND composite data were included in this




Figure 1. Examples of data sampled for NOAA Global Area Coverage and Global Vegetation Index products.

study. The five consecutive weeks began with 24-30 May 1988 and ended with the 7-day interval of 21-27 June 1987. Mean and standard deviations of the ND data for each week were computed for U.S. counties (LAC and GAC) and climatic divisions (LAC, GAC, GVI1, and GVI2) within the study area. The Land Analysis System (LAS, 1990) software developed jointly by NASA and the U.S. Geological Survey was utilized for the image processing included in this study.

A portion of the observed difference in mean ND values computed for the counties (or climatic divisions) included in the study is attributed to shifts in the boundaries of the counties between the resolutions of data (Wehde, 1982), as compared to loss of information due to the data reduction algorithms utilized. The observed difference in ND for the two resolutions was examined, however, statistical tests on the significance of these differences were not included in this study.

Analyses of the data included comparisons of the different resolutions on a weekly basis. Single composite data of individual counties and CD's, as well as week-to-week differences in the ND data for the various resolutions, were compared. Week-to-week comparisons utilized t-test analyses as only data of a similar resolution were compared for the two-week intervals.

Data Compositing

Daily visible and near-IR data used to compute the five weekly composites utilized in the data reduction analyses were combined with the daily data of the five subsequent weekly composite intervals to examine the influence of composite algorithms on satellite scan angle selection. Weekly composites were computed for 12 sites of varied vegetation based on the difference and normalized difference vegetation indices. Vegetation index values and scan angle selection were evaluated for the composites based on the two indices.

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

### Data Reduction

#### i. LAC, GAC, and GVI Comparisons: Entire Study Area

The means and standard deviations of normalized difference vegetation index (ND) values for the entire study area were similar throughout the 5 weeks of analysis (Table 1). The number of pixels included in the entire study area were 1,781,190 for the LAC images, 118,827 for the GAC images, and 7,938 for the GVI images.

Table 1. Mean, standard deviation, and coefficient of variation of the ND values for the entire study area by composite week and spatial resolution.

| Composite Interval | Resolution | ND Mean | ND s | ND c.v. (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 24 - 30 May (week 9) | LAC | .27 | .113 | 41.8 |
| | GAC | .27 | .110 | 40.7 |
| | GVI1 | .27 | .110 | 40.7 |
| | GVI2 | .27 | .100 | 37.0 |
| 31 May - 6 June (week 10) | LAC | .35 | .112 | 32.0 |
| | GAC | .34 | .109 | 32.0 |
| | GVI1 | .34 | .110 | 32.3 |
| | GVI2 | .34 | .099 | 29.1 |
| 7 - 13 June (week 11) | LAC | .30 | .116 | 38.7 |
| | GAC | .29 | .117 | 40.3 |
| | GVI1 | .29 | .118 | 40.7 |
| | GVI2 | .29 | .107 | 36.9 |
| 14 - 20 June (week 12) | LAC | .30 | .124 | 41.3 |
| | GAC | .30 | .120 | 40.0 |
| | GVI1 | .29 | .121 | 41.7 |
| | GVI2 | .30 | .111 | 37.0 |
| 21 - 27 June (week 13) | LAC | .28 | .127 | 45.4 |
| | GAC | .28 | .124 | 44.3 |
| | GVI1 | .28 | .125 | 44.6 |
| | GVI2 | .28 | .115 | 41.1 |

The mean ND values were similar for the four resolutions. The GVI2 data displayed smaller standard deviations and coefficients of variation, however, due to the greater spatial sampling of this data compared to the others.

The proportion of data for each of the four resolutions was examined by specific ranges of ND (Table 2). Proportions of the LAC, GAC, and GVI1 within the examined ranges of ND were similar for most of the composite weeks. The greatest proportion of data was, as expected, near the mean value for each of the resolutions within each

Table 2. The proportion of data for each of the four resolutions within the specified ranges of ND.

| sample | <0.0 | 0≤.15 | .16≤.25 | .26≤.35 | .36≤.45 | >.45 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | week 9 | | | |
| LAC | .10a† | 12.94a | 30.58a | 32.54a | 16.68a | 7.16a |
| GAC | .12a | 12.08a | 30.96a | 34.73b | 15.40b | 6.71a |
| GVI | .13a | 12.27a | 30.75a | 34.87b | 15.22b | 6.78a |
| GVI2 | .01a | 10.18b | 32.31b | 37.72c | 14.19c | 5.59b |
| | | | week 10 | | | |
| LAC | .11a | 2.89a | 16.46a | 29.85a | 31.72a | 18.97a |
| GAC | .11a | 2.71a | 16.63a | 32.00b | 30.82ab | 17.73b |
| GVI | .16a | 2.83a | 16.88a | 31.58b | 30.71b | 17.84b |
| GVI2 | .00a | 1.54b | 16.39a | 32.57b | 33.60c | 15.90c |
| | | | week 11 | | | |
| LAC | .27a | 5.94a | 28.69a | 29.84ab | 23.56a | 11.70a |
| GAC | .31a | 7.82b | 27.90a | 30.21ab | 22.21b | 9.85b |
| GVI | .35a | 8.20b | 30.15b | 29.25b | 22.46b | 9.59b |
| GVI2 | .10a | 6.42a | 30.52b | 30.80a | 24.51a | 7.65c |
| | | | week 12 | | | |
| LAC | .06a | 11.38a | 24.55a | 26.63a | 25.67a | 11.71a |
| GAC | .05a | 10.58a | 25.27a | 28.50b | 24.96a | 10.64b |
| GVI | .10a | 10.90a | 25.24a | 28.12b | 24.93a | 10.71ab |
| GVI2 | .00a | 8.18b | 27.43b | 29.03b | 26.90b | 8.46c |
| | | | week 13 | | | |
| LAC | .25a | 16.89a | 24.42a | 23.24a | 25.28a | 9.92a |
| GAC | .25a | 16.13a | 25.02a | 24.08b | 24.90a | 8.99ab |
| GVI | .34a | 16.48a | 25.22a | 24.02ab | 25.29a | 8.65b |
| GVI2 | .08a | 13.73b | 27.75b | 24.85b | 26.82b | 6.77c |

† values with same letter (a, b, or c) indicate similarity of proportions within 1%.

examined week (Table 1). The GVI2 sampling method displayed, as expected, greater proportions of data near the mean, and less within the low and high ranges of the data, compared to the other sampling algorithms. The proportions of GVI2 data within the examined ranges differed from those of the LAC or GAC resolutions to a greater extent than the GVI1 data.

ii. County LAC and GAC ND Value Comparisons.

The greatest difference between the mean county ND values of the LAC and GAC data occurred in week 11 (Table 3) when the mean of the differences was nearly 0.01 (values in table have been multiplied by $10^2$). The average difference between an ND value computed for a county at GAC and LAC resolution was usually less than 0.01.

Table 3. Mean ND values of LAC and GAC resolutions, and their differences, for the counties included in the study (n=544).

| week | sample | mean county ND values | | | | ND difference |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | max | min | mean | s | (X $10^2$) |
| 9 | LAC | .50 | .11 | .30 | .061 | .156 |
| | GAC | .43 | .16 | .30 | .055 | |
| 10 | LAC | .55 | .18 | .37 | .060 | .374 |
| | GAC | .50 | .22 | .37 | .055 | |
| 11 | LAC | .52 | .13 | .32 | .059 | .978 |
| | GAC | .45 | .17 | .32 | .052 | |
| 12 | LAC | .52 | .11 | .32 | .060 | .258 |
| | GAC | .46 | .17 | .31 | .053 | |
| 13 | LAC | .51 | .13 | .31 | .059 | .171 |
| | GAC | .45 | .17 | .31 | .054 | |

Detection of changes in vegetation condition, seasonally or week-to-week, is often considered a requirement for monitoring activities. Week-to-week comparisons of county ND values were made individually for the LAC and GAC resolutions, thus, the differences due to boundary shifts between resolutions was not a limitation to the analysis. The number of counties that displayed detectable differences in ND values varied between the examined weeks (Table 4). The LAC resolution data consistently permitted greater detection of week-to-week changes in county ND values compared to the GAC resolution. The LAC resolution ND values, for the four pairs of weeks examined, permitted detection of weekly differences in 86 to 98% of the counties. GAC resolution ND values permitted detection of weekly differences in 69 to 92% of the counties over the four pairs of weeks examined.

Table 4. Number of counties (total of 544 examined) with week-to-week significantly different values of ND.

| | paired weeks examined | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| resolution | 9-10 | 10-11 | 11-12 | 12-13 |
| LAC | 530 | 518 | 518 | 470 |
| GAC | 502 | 470 | 442 | 376 |

iii. Climatic division LAC, GAC, and GVI ND value Comparisons.

The mean range of ND values for the climatic divisions included in the study decreased with decreased resolution (Figure 2). The range of ND values for the LAC data averaged above 0.5 while the range of the GVI2 data was below 0.25. The mean of the standard deviations of the ND values within the CD's (Table 5) ranged between 0.076 and 0.068 for the LAC, GAC, and GVI1 data, respectively. The GVI2 ND values, however, displayed standard deviations less than 0.057.

Similar to the weekly comparisons of LAC and GAC ND values per county, ND values computed weekly for climatic divisions were compared by data resolution (Table 6). The greatest differences in the LAC and GAC data of the CD's, as was observed in the county analysis, occurred in week 11 when the mean difference was 0.01. Differences in LAC and GAC ND values greater than 0.001 existed for all of the weeks examined in the study. Differences in LAC and GVI ND values greater than 0.001 were observed for four of the five weeks examined.




Figure 2. Mean range of ND values for the climatic divisions included in the study, by week, for the LAC, GAC, GVI1, and GVI2 data.

Table 5. Weekly comparisons of ND values of LAC, GAC, GVI1, and GVI2 resolutions for the climatic divisions included in the study (n=70).

| week | sample | mean climatic division ND values | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | max | min | mean | s |
| 9 | LAC | .56 | .03 | .29 | .073 |
| | GAC | .50 | .07 | .29 | .069 |
| | GVI1 | .45 | .13 | .29 | .068 |
| | GVI2 | .41 | .17 | .29 | .054 |
| 10 | LAC | .62 | .07 | .36 | .074 |
| | GAC | .56 | .11 | .35 | .070 |
| | GVI1 | .51 | .18 | .35 | .069 |
| | GVI2 | .47 | .23 | .35 | .056 |
| 11 | LAC | .59 | -.02 | .31 | .073 |
| | GAC | .51 | .03 | .30 | .069 |
| | GVI1 | .46 | .13 | .30 | .069 |
| | GVI2 | .42 | .18 | .30 | .054 |
| 12 | LAC | .59 | -.02 | .31 | .076 |
| | GAC | .53 | .06 | .30 | .070 |
| | GVI1 | .47 | .14 | .30 | .070 |
| | GVI2 | .43 | .20 | .31 | .054 |
| 13 | LAC | .58 | .00 | .29 | .074 |
| | GAC | .52 | .06 | .29 | .070 |
| | GVI1 | .46 | .14 | .29 | .070 |
| | GVI2 | .42 | .18 | .29 | .055 |

The difference in reduced resolution estimates of ND due solely to shifts in the boundaries associated with the reduced resolution is demonstrated in the comparison of mean ND values for GAC and GVI2 (Table 6). GVI2 was computed as the mean of all GAC pixels within the GVI coverage area. The only difference between the two estimates for a given CD would be inclusion of some data at the GAC resolution in one CD while in an adjacent CD at the GVI resolution. The difference in mean ND values due to boundary shifts that occur with reduced resolution could account for a substantial amount of the differences observed between various resolutions of data (e.g. differences greater for GAC vs. GVI2 than GAC vs. GVI1). Although small differences in the

ND data of the various resolutions exist from week to week, the changes in the mean ND values within a CD are similar at all resolutions (Figure 3). All four examined resolutions displayed similar week-to-week fluctuations within the randomly selected CD.

Table 6. Results of weekly comparisons of ND values of LAC, GAC, and GVI resolutions for the climatic divisions included in the study (n=70).

| samples compared | mean ND difference ($X\ 10^2$) by week of analysis | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| LAC vs. GAC | .120 | .350 | 1.000 | .240 | .170 |
| LAC vs. GVI1 | .004 | .369 | 1.080 | .266 | .176 |
| LAC vs. GVI2 | -.013 | .288 | .997 | .160 | .128 |
| GAC vs. GVI1 | -.117 | .017 | .009 | .025 | .003 |
| GAC vs. GVI2 | -.134 | -.065 | -.024 | -.082 | -.042 |

<u>Data Compositing</u>

Twelve sites of varied vegetation types were selected for analysis of the data compositing algorithms (Table 7). Visible and near-IR data for a five by five pixel sample was computed for each site for each day included in the composite week. Each composite week included Saturday through Sunday observations to match the weekly time interval utilized in production of the NOAA GVI product. Daily satellite images were visually screened for cloud free observations prior to selection for inclusion in the weekly composite. Daily values of the Normalized Difference (ND) and Difference (DIFF) vegetation indices were computed and recorded with the satellite zenith angle (Table 8). Visible and near-IR reflectance data associated with the weekly observed maximum values of the ND and DIFF indices were retained for each site together with the satellite zenith angle data. ND values were computed for each composite week and site based on the visible and near-IR data selected




Figure 3. Mean LAC, GAC, GVI1, and GVI2 ND values for the five weeks of the study for climatic division No. 5 in Kansas.

Table 7. Study locations for compositing algorithm analyses.

| Site | Lat. ($^{o}$N) | Long. ($^{o}$W) | State/ Province | Vegetation Type |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 48.3 | 102.6 | ND | Crop/Grassland |
| 2 | 46.3 | 103.1 | ND | Crop/Grassland |
| 3 | 44.2 | 101.2 | SD | Grazing/Grassland |
| 4 | 43.0 | 95.7 | IA | Crop |
| 5 | 37.2 | 94.6 | KS | Crop/Grassland |
| 6 | 46.2 | 103.1 | ND | Crop/Grassland |
| 7 | 46.7 | 95.2 | MN | Forest/Crop |
| 8 | 48.8 | 94.3 | ONT | Forest |
| 9 | 41.4 | 95.7 | IA | Crop |
| 10 | 41.2 | 97.9 | NE | Crop |
| 11 | 40.5 | 98.2 | NE | Crop |
| 12 | 42.4 | 105.7 | WY | Forest |

by the maximum ND and DIFF values. The selection criteria, for composite week 9 of Site 3 (Table 8), resulted in selection of ND values of .29 (based on maximum ND) and .26 (based on maximum value of DIFF). Satellite zenith angles selected were 48$^{o}$ (positive number indicated forward scatter direction, negative indicates backscatter) based on the ND, and -35$^{o}$ based on the DIFF algorithm. ND values for Site 3, computed from visible and near-IR data selected by the maximum weekly ND algorithm, were consistently greater than those computed from data selected by the maximum weekly DIFF algorithm (Figure 4). Satellite zenith angles selected, based on the DIFF algorithm were predominantly from the backscatter direction while those selected with the ND algorithm were selected from both forward and backscatter directions.

Satellite zenith angles selected by the DIFF and ND composite algorithms for seven of the twelve sites examined in this study differed for greater than half of the observed weeks (Table 9). The similarity of scan angle selection by the two algorithms was as great as 80% for the 10 composite weeks examined due primarily to cloud contamination of ground observations through most of the composite interval. The similarity of selected angles was as low as 20% of those weeks evaluated (Site 6, Table 9).

ND values computed from the weekly DIFF composites were less than or equal to the values computed based on the ND composites due to the systematic satellite zenith (SZ) angle selection by the two indices. Negative SZ angles present a backscatter view and resulted in lower ND values than the near-nadir or forward scatter views favored by the ND composite algorithm (Figure 4). The DIFF composite algorithm




Figure 4. Weekly composited ND values and associated satellite zenith angles based on the ND ($ND_{ND}$) and DIFF ($ND_{DIFF}$) composite algorithms.

Table 8. Daily visible (vis), near-IR (nIR), ND, DIFF, and satellite zenith angle (satzen) values for site 3.

Site 3: 44.2°N, 101.2°W (Grazing/Grassland)

| date | composite week | vis | nIR | ND | DIFF | satzen |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| May 25 | 9 | 6.20 | 10.75 | 0.27 | 4.55 | 38.00 |
| 26 | 9 | 5.75 | 10.55 | 0.29 | 4.80 | 48.00 |
| 29 | 9 | 8.00 | 13.75 | 0.26 | 5.75 | -35.00 |
| June 2 | 10 | 11.00 | 14.75 | 0.15 | 3.75 | 24.00 |
| 3 | 10 | 7.05 | 12.10 | 0.26 | 5.05 | 36.00 |
| 4 | 10 | 9.25 | 13.20 | 0.18 | 3.95 | 46.00 |
| 5 | 10 | 5.75 | 11.20 | 0.32 | 5.45 | 54.00 |
| 6 | 10 | 9.70 | 17.00 | 0.27 | 7.30 | -47.00 |
| 7 | 11 | 8.70 | 14.55 | 0.25 | 5.85 | -37.00 |
| 8 | 11 | 7.50 | 11.55 | 0.21 | 4.05 | -24.00 |
| 9 | 11 | 6.90 | 10.00 | 0.18 | 3.10 | -9.00 |
| 18 | 12 | 15.45 | 18.85 | 0.10 | 3.40 | -11.00 |
| 19 | 12 | 6.15 | 9.55 | 0.22 | 3.40 | 4.00 |
| 20 | 12 | 5.90 | 9.30 | 0.22 | 3.40 | 19.00 |
| 21 | 13 | 6.90 | 10.20 | 0.19 | 3.30 | 32.00 |
| 25 | 13 | 9.70 | 14.15 | 0.19 | 4.45 | -40.00 |
| 26 | 13 | 8.50 | 12.10 | 0.17 | 3.60 | -28.00 |
| 28 | 14 | 21.65 | 23.60 | 0.04 | 1.95 | -2.00 |
| July 3 | 14 | 10.75 | 16.15 | 0.20 | 5.40 | -54.00 |
| 4 | 14 | 9.80 | 14.15 | 0.18 | 4.35 | -34.00 |
| 6 | 15 | 27.20 | 28.50 | 0.02 | 1.30 | -21.00 |
| 7 | 15 | 6.75 | 10.55 | 0.22 | 3.80 | -5.00 |
| 13 | 16 | 8.95 | 14.70 | 0.24 | 5.75 | -46.00 |
| 15 | 16 | 5.85 | 9.60 | 0.24 | 3.75 | -22.00 |
| 16 | 16 | 6.05 | 9.60 | 0.23 | 3.55 | -6.00 |
| 17 | 16 | 5.30 | 9.10 | 0.26 | 3.80 | 11.00 |
| 23 | 17 | 36.60 | 38.60 | 0.03 | 2.00 | -36.00 |
| 24 | 17 | 9.60 | 13.55 | 0.17 | 3.95 | -22.00 |
| 25 | 17 | 6.30 | 10.05 | 0.23 | 3.75 | -6.00 |
| 26 | 18 | 6.00 | 9.05 | 0.20 | 3.05 | 10.00 |
| 27 | 18 | 10.00 | 12.20 | 0.10 | 2.20 | -26.00 |
| 31 | 18 | 10.05 | 14.05 | 0.17 | 4.00 | -47.00 |

consistently, for the 12 study sites analyzed (Table 9, Figure 5), selected negative (backscatter) SZ angles when cloud free observations were available. The ND composite algorithm usually selected SZ angles nearer to a nadir view than the DIFF, however, large SZ angles in the forward scatter were occasionally selected by the ND algorithm over angles (positive or negative) nearer to nadir. Large forward scatter SZ angles, for example, were selected by the ND algorithm over the nearer-to-nadir angles selected by the DIFF index for weeks 9 and 10 of Sites 2 and 3 (Table 9).

Table 9. Visible (vis), near-IR (nIR), normalized difference (ND), and difference (DIFF) vegetation index values selected for the 10 weeks and 12 sites included in the study. Data selection was based on the weekly maximum ND and DIFF composite values.

| Site 1 (48.3 N, 102.6 W) | | | ND composite | | | | DIFF composite | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| date | week | vis | nIR | ND | DIFF | satzen | date | vis | nIR | ND | DIFF | satzen |
| May 25 | 9.00 | 5.75 | 11.50 | 0.33 | 5.75 | 35.00 | May 29 | 7.95 | 14.25 | 0.28 | 6.30 | -34.00 |
| June 3 | 10.00 | 5.15 | 11.00 | 0.36 | 5.85 | 33.00 | June 6 | 9.65 | 16.80 | 0.27 | 7.15 | -45.00 |
| 9 | 11.00 | 6.80 | 11.40 | 0.25 | 4.60 | -9.00 | 7 | 8.45 | 14.15 | 0.25 | 5.70 | -35.00 |
| 19 | 12.00 | 5.80 | 11.35 | 0.32 | 5.55 | 2.00 | 18 | 6.60 | 12.45 | 0.31 | 5.85 | -11.00 |
| 21 | 13.00 | 5.20 | 10.05 | 0.32 | 4.85 | 29.00 | 26 | 7.75 | 13.20 | 0.26 | 5.45 | -27.00 |
| July 3 | 14.00 | 9.60 | 18.10 | 0.31 | 8.50 | -52.00 | July 3 | 9.60 | 18.10 | 0.31 | 8.50 | -52.00 |
| 7 | 15.00 | 5.35 | 12.00 | 0.38 | 6.65 | -6.00 | 7 | 5.35 | 12.00 | 0.38 | 6.65 | -6.00 |
| 13 | 16.00 | 7.65 | 17.60 | 0.39 | 9.95 | -44.00 | 13 | 7.65 | 17.60 | 0.39 | 9.95 | -44.00 |
| 23 | 17.00 | 7.55 | 15.40 | 0.34 | 7.85 | -35.00 | 23 | 7.55 | 15.40 | 0.34 | 7.85 | -35.00 |
| 26 | 18.00 | 5.30 | 10.40 | 0.32 | 5.10 | 8.00 | 31 | 8.80 | 15.50 | 0.28 | 6.70 | -46.00 |
| | | | $\bar{x}$ = | 0.33 | 6.47 | -3.90 | | | $\bar{x}$ = | 0.31 | 7.01 | -33.50 |
| | | | s = | 0.04 | 1.67 | 30.09 | | | s = | 0.05 | 1.33 | 14.31 |

| Site 2 (46.3 N, 103.1 W) | | | ND composite | | | | DIFF composite | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| date | week | vis | nIR | ND | DIFF | satzen | date | vis | nIR | ND | DIFF | satzen |
| May 25 | 9.00 | 6.70 | 11.30 | 0.26 | 4.60 | 40.00 | May 29 | 8.00 | 13.45 | 0.25 | 5.45 | -30.00 |
| June 4 | 10.00 | 5.90 | 12.35 | 0.35 | 6.45 | 48.00 | June 6 | 9.50 | 16.60 | 0.27 | 7.10 | -42.40 |
| 7 | 11.00 | 8.35 | 15.00 | 0.28 | 6.65 | -31.80 | 7 | 8.35 | 15.00 | 0.28 | 6.65 | -31.80 |
| 19 | 12.00 | 5.90 | 11.10 | 0.31 | 5.20 | 9.00 | 19 | 5.90 | 11.10 | 0.31 | 5.20 | 9.00 |
| 21 | 13.00 | 6.10 | 11.45 | 0.30 | 5.35 | 35.00 | 25 | 9.30 | 14.90 | 0.23 | 5.60 | -35.00 |
| July 3 | 14.00 | 13.45 | 18.70 | 0.16 | 5.25 | -50.00 | July 3 | 13.45 | 18.70 | 0.16 | 5.25 | -50.00 |
| 7 | 15.00 | 5.90 | 10.55 | 0.28 | 4.65 | 2.00 | 7 | 5.90 | 10.55 | 0.28 | 4.65 | 2.00 |
| 13 | 16.00 | 9.40 | 15.00 | 0.23 | 5.60 | -41.00 | 13 | 9.40 | 15.00 | 0.23 | 5.60 | -41.00 |
| 25 | 17.00 | 7.00 | 10.70 | 0.21 | 3.70 | 0.00 | 24 | 7.80 | 11.60 | 0.20 | 3.80 | -16.00 |
| 26 | 18.00 | 12.50 | 15.60 | 0.11 | 3.10 | 16.00 | 26 | 12.50 | 15.60 | 0.11 | 3.10 | 16.00 |
| | | | $\bar{x}$ = | 0.25 | 5.06 | 2.72 | | | $\bar{x}$ = | 0.23 | 5.24 | -21.92 |
| | | | s = | 0.07 | 1.05 | 32.54 | | | s = | 0.06 | 1.13 | 22.15 |

| Site 3 (44.2 N, 101.2 W) | | | ND composite | | | | DIFF composite | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| date | week | vis | nIR | ND | DIFF | satzen | date | vis | nIR | ND | DIFF | satzen |
| May 26 | 9.00 | 5.75 | 10.55 | 0.29 | 4.80 | 48.00 | May 29 | 8.00 | 13.75 | 0.26 | 5.75 | -35.00 |
| June 5 | 10.00 | 5.75 | 11.20 | 0.32 | 5.45 | 54.00 | June 6 | 9.70 | 17.00 | 0.27 | 7.30 | -47.00 |
| 7 | 11.00 | 8.70 | 14.55 | 0.25 | 5.85 | -37.00 | 7 | 8.70 | 14.55 | 0.25 | 5.85 | -37.00 |
| 20 | 12.00 | 5.90 | 9.30 | 0.22 | 3.40 | 19.00 | 21 | 5.90 | 9.30 | 0.22 | 3.40 | 19.00 |
| 21 | 13.00 | 6.90 | 10.20 | 0.19 | 3.30 | 32.00 | 25 | 9.70 | 14.15 | 0.19 | 4.45 | -40.00 |
| July 3 | 14.00 | 21.50 | 16.15 | 0.20 | 5.40 | -54.00 | July 3 | 10.75 | 16.15 | 0.20 | 5.40 | -54.00 |
| 7 | 15.00 | 6.75 | 10.55 | 0.22 | 3.80 | -5.00 | 7 | 6.75 | 10.55 | 0.22 | 3.80 | -5.00 |
| 17 | 16.00 | 5.30 | 9.10 | 0.26 | 3.80 | 11.00 | 13 | 8.95 | 14.70 | 0.24 | 5.75 | -46.00 |
| 25 | 17.00 | 6.30 | 10.05 | 0.23 | 3.75 | -6.00 | 24 | 9.60 | 13.55 | 0.17 | 3.95 | -22.00 |
| 26 | 18.00 | 6.00 | 9.05 | 0.20 | 3.05 | 10.00 | 31 | 10.05 | 14.05 | 0.17 | 4.00 | -47.00 |
| | | | $\bar{x}$ = | 0.24 | 4.26 | 7.20 | | | $\bar{x}$ = | 0.22 | 4.97 | -31.40 |
| | | | s = | 0.04 | 0.97 | 32.64 | | | s = | 0.04 | 1.17 | 21.57 |

Table 9 (cont.)

Site 4 (43.0 N, 95.7 W)

| ND composite | | | | | | | DIFF composite | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| date | week | vis | nIR | ND | DIFF | satzen | date | vis | nIR | ND | DIFF | satzen |
| May 25 | 9.00 | 4.90 | 7.95 | 0.24 | 3.05 | 15.00 | May 25 | 4.90 | 7.95 | 0.24 | 3.05 | 15.00 |
| June 5 | 10.00 | 4.60 | 9.25 | 0.34 | 4.65 | 39.00 | June 6 | 9.00 | 16.70 | 0.30 | 7.70 | -61.00 |
| 9 | 11.00 | 6.90 | 14.05 | 0.34 | 7.15 | -35.00 | 9 | 6.90 | 14.05 | 0.34 | 7.15 | -35.00 |
| 20 | 12.00 | 4.50 | 12.25 | 0.46 | 7.75 | -8.00 | 18 | 7.10 | 15.15 | 0.36 | 8.05 | -36.10 |
| 21 | 13.00 | 4.25 | 12.50 | 0.49 | 8.25 | 7.40 | 25 | 7.50 | 21.90 | 0.49 | 14.40 | -56.00 |
| July 4 | 14.00 | 7.45 | 20.90 | 0.47 | 13.45 | -60.00 | 4 | 7.45 | 20.90 | 0.47 | 13.45 | -60.00 |
| 6 | 15.00 | 6.05 | 19.50 | 0.53 | 13.45 | -44.00 | 6 | 6.05 | 19.50 | 0.53 | 13.45 | -44.00 |
| 16 | 16.00 | 5.00 | 19.10 | 0.59 | 14.10 | -34.00 | 13 | 7.50 | 22.10 | 0.49 | 14.60 | -61.00 |
| 25 | 17.00 | 4.75 | 18.25 | 0.59 | 13.50 | -34.00 | 23 | 7.10 | 21.75 | 0.51 | 14.65 | -54.00 |
| 26 | 18.00 | 4.25 | 16.40 | 0.59 | 12.15 | -20.00 | 31 | 8.05 | 20.80 | 0.44 | 12.75 | -62.00 |
| | | | $\bar{x}$ = | 0.46 | 9.75 | -17.36 | | | $\bar{x}$ = | 0.42 | 10.93 | -45.41 |
| | | | s = | 0.12 | 3.87 | 28.85 | | | s = | 0.09 | 3.88 | 22.38 |

Site 5 (37.2 N, 94.6 W)

| ND composite | | | | | | | DIFF composite | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| date | week | vis | nIR | ND | DIFF | satzen | date | vis | nIR | ND | DIFF | satzen |
| May 25 | 9.00 | 3.60 | 13.50 | 0.58 | 9.90 | 21.00 | May 26 | 3.80 | 14.20 | 0.58 | 10.40 | 36.00 |
| June 5 | 10.00 | 4.30 | 13.70 | 0.52 | 9.40 | 45.00 | June 6 | 8.50 | 19.40 | 0.39 | 10.90 | -62.00 |
| 9 | 11.00 | 6.50 | 16.55 | 0.44 | 10.05 | -33.00 | 9 | 6.50 | 16.55 | 0.44 | 10.05 | -33.00 |
| 19 | 12.00 | 5.90 | 13.70 | 0.40 | 7.80 | -20.00 | 19 | 5.90 | 13.70 | 0.40 | 7.80 | -20.00 |
| 21 | 13.00 | 5.40 | 12.50 | 0.40 | 7.10 | 14.00 | 21 | 5.40 | 12.50 | 0.40 | 7.10 | 14.00 |
| July 4 | 14.00 | 8.25 | 15.60 | 0.31 | 7.35 | -61.00 | July 4 | 8.25 | 15.60 | 0.31 | 7.35 | -61.00 |
| 7 | 15.00 | 6.40 | 15.20 | 0.41 | 8.80 | -31.00 | 7 | 6.40 | 15.20 | 0.41 | 8.80 | -31.00 |
| 13 | 16.00 | 8.00 | 17.30 | 0.37 | 9.30 | -62.00 | 13 | 8.00 | 17.30 | 0.37 | 9.30 | -62.00 |
| 24 | 17.00 | 7.25 | 16.20 | 0.38 | 8.95 | -45.00 | 24 | 7.25 | 16.20 | 0.38 | 8.95 | -45.00 |
| 26 | 18.00 | 4.60 | 13.65 | 0.50 | 9.05 | -16.00 | 31 | 7.85 | 18.35 | 0.40 | 10.50 | -62.00 |
| | | | $\bar{x}$ = | 0.43 | 8.77 | -18.80 | | | $\bar{x}$ = | 0.41 | 9.12 | -32.60 |
| | | | s = | 0.08 | 0.97 | 33.80 | | | s = | 0.07 | 1.29 | 32.55 |

Site 6 (46.2 N, 103.1 W)

| ND composite | | | | | | | DIFF composite | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| date | week | vis | nIR | ND | DIFF | satzen | date | vis | nIR | ND | DIFF | satzen |
| May 26 | 9.00 | 7.70 | 13.20 | 0.26 | 5.50 | 50.10 | May 26 | 7.70 | 13.20 | 0.26 | 5.50 | 50.10 |
| June 4 | 10.00 | 6.15 | 12.20 | 0.33 | 6.05 | 49.00 | June 5 | 6.70 | 13.05 | 0.32 | 6.35 | 56.00 |
| 7 | 11.00 | 8.55 | 14.80 | 0.27 | 6.25 | -30.00 | 7 | 8.55 | 14.80 | 0.27 | 6.25 | -30.00 |
| 19 | 12.00 | 6.60 | 11.55 | 0.27 | 4.95 | 11.20 | 19 | 6.60 | 11.55 | 0.27 | 4.95 | 11.20 |
| 21 | 13.00 | 7.20 | 12.40 | 0.27 | 5.20 | 37.00 | 21 | 7.20 | 12.40 | 0.27 | 5.20 | 37.00 |
| July 3 | 14.00 | 10.65 | 16.85 | 0.23 | 6.20 | -50.00 | July 3 | 10.65 | 16.85 | 0.23 | 6.20 | -50.00 |
| 7 | 15.00 | 5.80 | 11.20 | 0.32 | 5.40 | 2.00 | 7 | 5.80 | 11.20 | 0.32 | 5.40 | 2.00 |
| 13 | 16.00 | 8.90 | 15.55 | 0.27 | 6.65 | -41.00 | 13 | 8.90 | 15.55 | 0.27 | 6.65 | -41.00 |
| 24 | 17.00 | 7.10 | 11.60 | 0.24 | 4.50 | -16.00 | 24 | 7.10 | 11.60 | 0.24 | 4.50 | -16.00 |
| 26 | 18.00 | 6.90 | 10.90 | 0.22 | 4.00 | 16.00 | 31 | 10.15 | 14.75 | 0.18 | 4.60 | -42.00 |
| | | | $\bar{x}$ = | 0.27 | 5.47 | 2.83 | | | $\bar{x}$ = | 0.24 | 5.05 | -2.06 |
| | | | s = | 0.03 | 0.80 | 34.53 | | | s = | 0.08 | 1.74 | 35.93 |

Table 9 (cont.)

Site 7 (46.7 N, 95.2 W)

| date | week | vis | nIR (ND composite) | ND | DIFF | satzen | date (DIFF composite) | vis | nIR | ND | DIFF | satzen |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| May 25 | 9.00 | 5.15 | 12.90 | 0.43 | 7.75 | -4.00 | May 29 | 10.10 | 21.55 | 0.36 | 11.45 | -61.00 |
| June 6 | 10.00 | 8.60 | 22.20 | 0.44 | 13.60 | -66.00 | June 6 | 8.60 | 22.20 | 0.44 | 13.60 | -66.00 |
| 9 | 11.00 | 7.10 | 20.70 | 0.49 | 13.60 | -46.00 | 7 | 8.90 | 22.90 | 0.44 | 14.00 | -61.00 |
| 20 | 12.00 | 5.60 | 14.80 | 0.45 | 9.20 | -24.00 | 19 | 6.55 | 17.30 | 0.45 | 10.75 | -37.00 |
| 25 | 13.00 | 8.95 | 22.35 | 0.43 | 13.40 | -62.00 | 26 | 10.40 | 24.45 | 0.40 | 14.05 | -56.00 |
| July 3 | 14.00 | 12.60 | 19.90 | 0.22 | 7.30 | -67.00 | July 3 | 12.60 | 19.90 | 0.22 | 7.30 | -67.00 |
| 7 | 15.00 | 8.80 | 18.70 | 0.36 | 9.90 | -39.00 | 7 | 8.80 | 18.70 | 0.36 | 9.90 | -39.00 |
| 16 | 16.00 | 7.00 | 17.50 | 0.43 | 10.50 | -40.00 | 13 | 9.35 | 21.50 | 0.39 | 12.15 | -63.00 |
| 24 | 17.00 | 8.50 | 19.65 | 0.40 | 11.15 | -50.00 | 24 | 8.50 | 19.65 | 0.40 | 11.15 | -50.00 |
| 26 | 18.00 | 6.30 | 14.90 | 0.41 | 8.60 | -29.00 | 31 | 9.00 | 18.75 | 0.35 | 9.75 | -64.00 |
| | | | $\bar{x}$ = | 0.41 | 10.50 | -42.70 | | | $\bar{x}$ = | 0.38 | 11.41 | -56.40 |
| | | | s = | 0.07 | 2.27 | 19.04 | | | s = | 0.06 | 2.04 | 10.34 |

Site 8 (48.8 N, 94.3 W)

| date | week | vis | nIR (ND composite) | ND | DIFF | satzen | date (DIFF composite) | vis | nIR | ND | DIFF | satzen |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| May 26 | 9.00 | 4.75 | 9.65 | 0.34 | 4.90 | 2.00 | May 26 | 4.75 | 9.65 | 0.34 | 4.90 | 2.00 |
| June 5 | 10.00 | 3.30 | 12.20 | 0.57 | 8.90 | 16.00 | June 6 | 7.50 | 20.05 | 0.46 | 12.55 | -68.00 |
| 9 | 11.00 | 6.00 | 21.50 | 0.56 | 15.50 | -50.00 | 8 | 7.25 | 25.10 | 0.55 | 17.85 | -58.00 |
| 20 | 12.00 | 4.30 | 15.75 | 0.57 | 11.45 | -31.00 | 19 | 5.15 | 17.00 | 0.53 | 11.85 | -42.00 |
| 21 | 13.00 | 3.90 | 13.60 | 0.55 | 9.70 | -18.00 | 26 | 7.40 | 22.15 | 0.50 | 14.75 | -59.00 |
| 28 | 14.00 | 13.70 | 23.15 | 0.26 | 9.45 | -44.00 | 28 | 13.70 | 23.15 | 0.26 | 9.45 | -44.00 |
| July 7 | 15.00 | 6.10 | 17.95 | 0.49 | 11.85 | -44.00 | July 6 | 6.50 | 18.60 | 0.48 | 12.10 | -52.00 |
| 17 | 16.00 | 4.60 | 16.25 | 0.56 | 11.65 | -35.00 | 13 | 7.35 | 19.90 | 0.46 | 12.55 | -65.00 |
| 24 | 17.00 | 8.35 | 15.40 | 0.30 | 7.05 | -53.00 | 23 | 11.65 | 19.50 | 0.25 | 7.85 | -60.00 |
| 27 | 18.00 | 3.75 | 13.35 | 0.56 | 9.60 | -23.00 | 31 | 7.95 | 18.35 | 0.40 | 10.40 | -65.00 |
| | | | $\bar{x}$ = | 0.48 | 10.01 | -28.00 | | | $\bar{x}$ = | 0.42 | 11.43 | -51.10 |
| | | | s = | 0.12 | 2.74 | 21.54 | | | s = | 0.10 | 3.40 | 19.53 |

Site 9 (41.4 N, 95.7 W)

| date | week | vis | nIR (ND composite) | ND | DIFF | satzen | date (DIFF composite) | vis | nIR | ND | DIFF | satzen |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| May 25 | 9.00 | 5.75 | 11.55 | 0.34 | 5.80 | 12.00 | May 25 | 5.75 | 11.55 | 0.34 | 5.80 | 12.00 |
| June 5 | 10.00 | 5.40 | 12.60 | 0.40 | 7.20 | 40.00 | June 6 | 10.10 | 20.25 | 0.33 | 10.15 | -65.00 |
| 9 | 11.00 | 8.05 | 16.90 | 0.35 | 8.85 | -40.00 | 9 | 8.05 | 16.90 | 0.35 | 8.85 | -40.00 |
| 20 | 12.00 | 5.60 | 12.80 | 0.39 | 7.20 | -11.00 | 18 | 7.35 | 16.00 | 0.37 | 8.65 | -42.00 |
| 26 | 13.00 | 8.50 | 21.20 | 0.43 | 12.70 | -52.00 | 26 | 8.50 | 21.20 | 0.43 | 12.70 | -52.00 |
| July 4 | 14.00 | 8.20 | 21.70 | 0.45 | 13.50 | -60.00 | July 4 | 8.20 | 21.70 | 0.45 | 13.50 | -60.00 |
| 7 | 15.00 | 5.90 | 17.50 | 0.50 | 11.60 | -30.00 | 6 | 6.60 | 18.70 | 0.48 | 12.10 | -43.00 |
| 16 | 16.00 | 5.00 | 17.95 | 0.56 | 12.95 | -32.00 | 13 | 8.10 | 21.20 | 0.45 | 13.10 | -60.00 |
| 25 | 17.00 | 4.90 | 18.60 | 0.58 | 13.70 | -32.00 | 25 | 7.05 | 22.15 | 0.52 | 15.10 | -53.00 |
| 26 | 18.00 | 4.30 | 16.20 | 0.58 | 11.90 | -17.00 | 31 | 8.30 | 21.60 | 0.44 | 13.30 | -61.00 |
| | | | $\bar{x}$ = | 0.46 | 10.54 | -22.20 | | | $\bar{x}$ = | 0.42 | 11.33 | -46.40 |
| | | | s = | 0.09 | 2.83 | 28.42 | | | s = | 0.06 | 2.71 | 21.18 |

Table 9 (cont.)

Site 10 (41.2 N, 97.9 W)

| | | | ND composite | | | | DIFF composite | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| date | week | vis | nIR | ND | DIFF | satzen | date | vis | nIR | ND | DIFF | satzen |
| May 26 | 9.00 | 7.25 | 11.35 | 0.22 | 4.15 | 39.00 | May 26 | 7.20 | 11.35 | 0.22 | 4.15 | 39.00 |
| June 5 | 10.00 | 5.25 | 10.70 | 0.34 | 5.45 | 49.00 | June 6 | 9.60 | 16.30 | 0.26 | 6.70 | -60.00 |
| 9 | 11.00 | 6.30 | 11.70 | 0.30 | 5.40 | -29.00 | 7 | 8.35 | 15.40 | 0.30 | 7.05 | -52.00 |
| 20 | 12.00 | 4.45 | 10.25 | 0.39 | 5.80 | 3.00 | 18 | 6.80 | 13.35 | 0.33 | 6.55 | -31.00 |
| 26 | 13.00 | 6.70 | 16.80 | 0.43 | 10.10 | -44.00 | 26 | 6.70 | 16.80 | 0.43 | 10.10 | -44.00 |
| July 4 | 14.00 | 7.20 | 18.75 | 0.45 | 11.55 | -55.00 | July 4 | 7.20 | 18.75 | 0.45 | 11.55 | -55.00 |
| 6 | 15.00 | 5.20 | 16.10 | 0.51 | 10.90 | -33.00 | 6 | 5.20 | 16.10 | 0.51 | 10.90 | -33.00 |
| 15 | 16.00 | 5.05 | 18.00 | 0.56 | 12.95 | -33.00 | 13 | 6.80 | 20.95 | 0.51 | 14.15 | -55.00 |
| 25 | 17.00 | 4.05 | 15.10 | 0.58 | 11.05 | -19.00 | 23 | 6.45 | 18.75 | 0.49 | 12.30 | -47.00 |
| 26 | 18.00 | 3.50 | 13.65 | 0.59 | 10.15 | -2.00 | 31 | 7.40 | 19.95 | 0.46 | 12.55 | -56.00 |
| | | | $\bar{x}$ = | 0.44 | 8.75 | -12.40 | | | $\bar{x}$ = | 0.39 | 9.60 | -39.40 |
| | | | s = | 0.12 | 3.02 | 32.77 | | | s = | 0.10 | 3.10 | 27.72 |

Site 11 (40.5 N, 98.2 W)

| | | | ND composite | | | | DIFF composite | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| date | week | vis | nIR | ND | DIFF | satzen | date | vis | nIR | ND | DIFF | satzen |
| May 25 | 9.00 | 6.75 | 15.50 | 0.39 | 8.75 | 28.00 | May 25 | 6.75 | 15.50 | 0.39 | 8.75 | 28.00 |
| June 5 | 10.00 | 5.15 | 14.40 | 0.47 | 9.25 | 51.00 | June 5 | 5.15 | 14.40 | 0.47 | 9.25 | 51.00 |
| 7 | 11.00 | 8.20 | 16.85 | 0.35 | 8.65 | -51.00 | 7 | 8.20 | 16.85 | 0.35 | 8.65 | -51.00 |
| 20 | 12.00 | 5.40 | 12.15 | 0.38 | 6.75 | 7.00 | 18 | 7.50 | 14.80 | 0.33 | 7.30 | -29.00 |
| 21 | 13.00 | 5.45 | 12.55 | 0.39 | 7.10 | 23.00 | 26 | 8.20 | 17.20 | 0.35 | 9.00 | -42.00 |
| July 4 | 14.00 | 8.20 | 17.50 | 0.36 | 9.30 | -54.00 | July 4 | 8.20 | 17.50 | 0.36 | 9.30 | -54.00 |
| 6 | 15.00 | 6.65 | 14.80 | 0.38 | 8.15 | -30.00 | 6 | 6.65 | 14.80 | 0.38 | 8.15 | -30.00 |
| 17 | 16.00 | 4.50 | 12.50 | 0.47 | 8.00 | -45.00 | 13 | 8.25 | 17.90 | 0.37 | 9.65 | -54.00 |
| 25 | 17.00 | 5.05 | 13.50 | 0.46 | 8.45 | 1.00 | 23 | 8.30 | 17.40 | 0.35 | 9.10 | -33.00 |
| 27 | 18.00 | 4.20 | 12.30 | 0.49 | 8.10 | -55.00 | 31 | 8.85 | 18.00 | 0.34 | 9.15 | -56.00 |
| | | | $\bar{x}$ = | 0.41 | 8.25 | -12.50 | | | $\bar{x}$ = | 0.37 | 8.83 | -27.00 |
| | | | s = | 0.05 | 0.79 | 37.24 | | | s = | 0.04 | 0.64 | 35.01 |

Site 12 (42.4 N, 105.7 W)

| | | | ND composite | | | | DIFF composite | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| date | week | vis | nIR | ND | DIFF | satzen | date | vis | nIR | ND | DIFF | satzen |
| May 26 | 9.00 | 7.50 | 11.30 | 0.20 | 3.80 | 61.00 | May 25 | 11.30 | 15.55 | 0.16 | 4.25 | 54.00 |
| June 6 | 10.00 | 5.60 | 12.90 | 0.39 | 7.30 | -35.00 | June 6 | 5.60 | 12.90 | 0.39 | 7.30 | -35.00 |
| 7 | 11.00 | 4.40 | 10.00 | 0.39 | 5.60 | -20.00 | 7 | 4.40 | 10.00 | 0.39 | 5.60 | -20.00 |
| 19 | 12.00 | 3.40 | 7.60 | 0.38 | 4.20 | 30.00 | 18 | 3.50 | 7.75 | 0.38 | 4.25 | 13.00 |
| 25 | 13.00 | 5.15 | 10.75 | 0.35 | 5.60 | -22.00 | 25 | 5.15 | 10.75 | 0.35 | 5.60 | -22.00 |
| July 4 | 14.00 | 5.85 | 12.70 | 0.37 | 6.85 | -24.00 | July 4 | 5.85 | 12.70 | 0.37 | 6.85 | -24.00 |
| 7 | 15.00 | 5.45 | 9.90 | 0.29 | 4.45 | 27.00 | 7 | 5.45 | 9.90 | 0.29 | 4.45 | 27.00 |
| 17 | 16.00 | 3.70 | 8.70 | 0.40 | 5.00 | 39.00 | 13 | 5.25 | 10.40 | 0.33 | 5.15 | -25.00 |
| 23 | 17.00 | 4.45 | 8.70 | 0.32 | 4.25 | -9.00 | 23 | 4.45 | 8.70 | 0.32 | 4.25 | -9.00 |
| 27 | 18.00 | 10.80 | 14.50 | 0.15 | 3.70 | 49.00 | 27T | 10.80 | 14.50 | 0.15 | 3.70 | 49.00 |
| | | | $\bar{x}$ = | 0.33 | 5.08 | 9.60 | | | $\bar{x}$ = | 0.31 | 5.14 | 0.80 |
| | | | s = | 0.08 | 1.18 | 33.34 | | | s = | 0.09 | 1.14 | 30.98 |




Figure 5. Satellite zenith angle selection based on maximum ND and DIFF composites for the 12 sites and 10 weeks evaluated (n=120).

## IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Spatial averaging of satellite derived data reduces data processing expenses, computer processing time, and data storage requirements. Thus, increased spatial analysis is possible when low compared to high resolutions of data are utilized. Comparisons of county and climatic division averages of the various resolutions of data indicated that differences existed between the examined resolutions and sampling algorithms included in this study, however, a portion of the difference was not due to the reduction of the resolution of the satellite data but to shifts in county and climatic division boundaries as a result of data reduction.

GAC resolution data provided essentially the same values as LAC for the spatial areas associated with U.S. counties in the Great Plains region (average area 2,817 $km^2$). Similarly, for the areas associated with the examined climatic divisions (average area 21,825 $km^2$) GVI1, GVI2, and GAC data provided essentially the same values as LAC. Vegetation index data derived for the climatic divisions computed with the GVI1 algorithm were more representative of the LAC and GAC data than were the VI data computed with the GVI2 algorithm. The overall results of this study suggest that NOAA continues to use the current algorithm for GVI data reduction compared to an average of all GAC samples within a GVI pixel.

The DIFF composite algorithm consistently, for the 12 study sites analyzed, selected negative (backscatter) SZ angles when possible. The ND composite algorithm usually selected SZ angles nearer to a nadir view than the DIFF, however, large SZ angles in the forward scatter were occasionally selected by the ND algorithm over angles (positive or negative) nearer to nadir.

In summary, while differences existed between the vegetation index values computed for the examined data resolutions when computed over specific spatial areas, the mean values of the low resolution data were representative of the full resolution data, and if utilized in monitoring activities, would likely provide the similar results. The ND and DIFF algorithms, utilized in data compositing, each displayed deficiencies as selectors of near-nadir views of land surface features. The simple difference would be the recommended algorithm for satellite zenith angle selection if advantages exist for selection of backscatter views of vegetation from satellites.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors acknowledge the data analysis contributions by J. Hanson and A. Trautwein, and reviews by B. Quirk and G. Gutman. Figure 1 is an adaptation of a figure provided by Dr. K. Turcotte.

V. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Eidenshink, J.C., Haas, R.H., Zokaites, D.M., Ohlen, D.O., and K.P. Gallo. 1989. Integration of remote sensing and GIS technology to monitor fire danger in the northern Great Plains. Proceedings, National Conference on Geographic Information Systems, Canadian Institute of Surveying and Mapping. 27 February - 3 March, Ottawa, Canada, pp. 944-956.

Dickinson, R.E., Henderson-Sellers, A., Kennedy, P.J., and M.F. Wilson. 1986. Biosphere-atmosphere transfer scheme (BATS) for the NCAR community climate model. NCAR Technical Note NCAR/NT-275+STR. NCAR, Boulder, CO, USA.

Gallo, K.P., and T.K. Flesch. 1989. Large area crop monitoring with the NOAA AVHRR: estimating the silking stage of corn development. Rem. Sens. Environ. 27:73-80.

Gallo, K.P., and T.R. Heddinghaus. 1989. The use of satellite-derived vegetation indices as indicators of climatic variability. Proceedings, Amer. Meterol. Soc. Sixth Conf. on Applied Climatology, 7-10 March 1989, Charleston, SC, pp. 244-247.

Gutman, G. 1987. The derivation of vegetation indices from AVHRR data. Int. J. Remote Sensing. 8:1235-1243.

Justice, C.O., Markham, B.L., Townshend, J.R.G. and R.L. Kennard. 1989. Spatial degradation of satellite data. Int. J. Remote Sensing. 10:1539-1561.

Kidwell, K.P. 1986. NOAA Polar Orbiter Data (TIROS-N, NOAA-6, NOAA-7, NOAA-9, NOAA-9, and NOAA-10) Users Guide, U.S. Dept. Commerce. NOAA/NESDIS, Washington, D.C. 20233.

Kidwell, K.P. (ed). 1990. Global Vegetation Index User's Guide. Satellite Data Services Div., NOAA/NESDIS, Washington, D.C. 20233

LAS. 1989. Overview of the Land Analysis System; Version 5. USGS/NMD EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD 57198.

Perry, C.R., Jr. and L.F. Lautenschlager. 1984. Functional equivalence of spectral vegetation indices. Rem. Sens. Environ. 14:169-182.

Tarpley, J.D., Schneider, S.R., and R.L. Money. 1984. Global vegetation indices from the NOAA-7 meteorological satellite. J. Appl. Meteorol. 23:491-493.

Townshend, J.R.G., and C.O. Justice. 1988. Selecting the spatial resolution of satellite sensors required for global monitoring of land transformations. Intl. J. Rem. Sensing. 9:187-236.

Wehde, M. 1982. Grid cell size in relation to errors in maps and inventories produced by computerized map processing. Photogram. Engr. and Rem. Sensing. 48:1289-1298.

(continued from inside cover)

NESDIS 19 The Space Station Polar Platform: Intergrating Research and Operational Missions. John H. McElroy and Stanley R. Schneider, January 1985. (PB85 195279/AS)

NESDIS 20 An Atlas of High Altitude Aircraft Measured Radiance of White Sands, New Mexico, in the 450-1050nm Band. Gilbert R. Smith, Robert H. Levin and John S. Knoll, April 1985. (PB85 204501/AS)

NESDIS 21 High Altitude Measured Radiance of White Sands, New Mexico, in the 400-2000nm Band Using a Filter Wedge Spectrometer. Gilbert R. Smith and Robert H. Levin, April 1985. (PB85 206084/AS)

NESDIS 22 The Space Station Polar Platform: NOAA Systems Considerations and Requirements. John H. McElroy and Stanley R. Schneider, June 1985. (PB86 6109246/AS)

NESDIS 23 The Use of TOMS Data in Evaluating and Improving the Total Ozone from TOVS Measurements. James H. Lienesch and Prabhat K.K. Pandey, July 1985. (PB86 108412/AS)

NESDIS 24 Satellite-Derived Moisture Profiles. Andrew Timchalk, April 1986. (PB86 232923/AS)

NESDIS 25 reserved

NESDIS 26 Monthly and Seasonal Mean Outgoing Longwave Radiation and Anomalies. Arnold Gruber, Marylin Varnadore, Phillip A. Arkin, and Jay S. Winston, October 1987. (PB87160545/AS)

NESDIS 27 Estimation of Broadband Planetary Albedo from Operational Narrowband Satellite Measurements. James Wydick, April 1987. (PB88-107644/AS)

NESDIS 28 The AVHRR/HIRS Operational Method for Satellite Based Sea Surface Temperature Determination. Charles Walton, March 1987. (PB88-107594/AS)

NESDIS 29 The Complementary Roles of Microwave and Infrared Instruments in Atmospheric Sounding. Larry McMillin, February 1987. (PB87 184917/AS)

NESDIS 30 Planning for Future Generational Sensors and Other Priorities. James C. Fischer, June 1987. (PB87 220802/AS)

NESDIS 31 Data Processing Algorithms for Inferring Stratospheric Gas Concentrations from Balloon-Based Solar Occultation Data. I-Lok Chang (American University) and Michael P. Weinreb, April 1987. (PB87 196424)

NESDIS 32 Precipitation Detection with Satellite Microwave Data. Yang Chenggang and Andrew Timchalk, June 1988. (PB88-240239)

NESDIS 33 An Introduction to the GOES I-M Imager and Sounder Instruments and the GVAR Retransmission Format. Raymond J. Komajda (Mitre Corp) and Keith McKenzie, October 1987. (PB88-132739)

NESDIS 34 Balloon-Based Infrared Solar Occultation Measurements of Stratospheric O3, H2O, HNo3, and CF2Cl2. Michael P. Weinreb and I-Lok Chang (American University), September 1987. (PB88-132725)

NESDIS 35 Passive Microwave Observing From Environmental Satellites, A Status Report Based on NOAA's June 1-4, 1987, Conference in Williamsburg, Virginia. James C. Fischer, November 1987. (PB88-208236)

NESDIS 36 Pre-Launch Calibration of Channels 1 and 2 of the Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer. C.R. Nagaraja Rao, October 1987. (PB88-157169 A/S)

NESDIS 39 General Determination of Earth Surface Type and Cloud Amount Using Multispectral AVHRR Data. Irvin Ruff and Arnold Gruber, February 1988. (PB88-199195/AS)

NESDIS 40 The GOES I-M System Functional Description. Carolyn Bradley (Mitre Corp), November 1988.

NESDIS 41 Report of the Earth Radiation Budget Requirements Review - 1987 Rosslyn, Virginia, 30 March - 3 April 1987. L.L. Stowe (Editor), June 1988.

NESDIS 42 Simulation Studies of Improved Sounding Systems. H. Yates, D. Wark, H. Aumann, N. Evans, N. Phillips, J. Sussking, L. McMillin, A. Goldman, M. Chahine, and L. Crone, February 1989.

NESDIS 43 Adjustment of Microwave Spectral Radiances of the Earth to a Fixed Angle of Progagation. D. Q. Wark, December 1988. (PB89-162556/AS)

NESDIS 44 Educator's Guide for Building and Operating Environmental Satellite Receiving Stations. R. Joe Summers, Chambersburg Senior High, February 1989.

NESDIS 45 Final Report on the Modulation and EMC Considerations for the HRPT Transmission System in the Post NOAA-M Polar Orbiting Satellite ERA. James C. Fischer (Editor), June 1989. (PB89-223812/AS)

NESDIS 46 MECCA Program Documentation. Kurt W. Hess, September 1989.

NESDIS 47 A General Method of Using Prior Information in a Simultaneous Equation System. Lawrence J. Crone, David S Crosby, and Larry M. McMillin, October 1989.

NESDIS 48 Reserved

NESDIS 49 Implementation of Reflectance Models in Operational AVHRR Radiation Budget Processing. V. Ray Taylor, February 1990.

NESDIS 50 Reserved

NESDIS 51 The Impact of NOAA Satellite Soundings on the Numerical Analysis and Forecast System of the People's Republic of China. A. Gruber and W. Zonghao, May 1990.

## NOAA SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL PUBLICATIONS

*The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration* was established as part of the Department of Commerce on October 3, 1970. The mission responsibilities of NOAA are to assess the socioeconomic impact of natural and technological changes in the environment and to monitor and predict the state of the solid Earth, the oceans and their living resources, the atmosphere, and the space environment of the Earth.

The major components of NOAA regularly produce various types of scientific and technical information in the following kinds of publications:

PROFESSIONAL PAPERS—Important definitive research results, major techniques, and special investigations.

CONTRACT AND GRANT REPORTS—Reports prepared by contractors or grantees under NOAA sponsorship.

ATLAS—Presentation of analyzed data generally in the form of maps showing distribution of rainfall, chemical and physical conditions of oceans and atmosphere, distribution of fishes and marine mammals, ionospheric conditions, etc.

TECHNICAL SERVICE PUBLICATIONS—Reports containing data, observations, instructions, etc. A partial listing includes data serials; prediction and outlook periodicals; technical manuals, training papers, planning reports, and information serials; and miscellaneous technical publications.

TECHNICAL REPORTS—Journal quality with extensive details, mathematical developments, or data listings.

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUMS—Reports of preliminary, partial, or negative research or technology results, interim instructions, and the like.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
**NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION**
NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITE, DATA, AND INFORMATION SERVICE
**Washington, D.C. 20233**

# SUPPLEMENTARY

# INFORMATION

AD-A227 397

# ERRATA

NOAA TECHNICAL REPORT NESDIS 54

EVALUATION OF DATA REDUCTION AND COMPOSITING
OF THE NOAA GLOBAL VEGETATION INDEX PRODUCT:
A CASE STUDY

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | | pages |
|---|---|---|
| | List of Tables | iv |
| | List of Figures | iv |
| | ABSTRACT | 1 |
| I. | INTRODUCTION | 3 |
| | Data Reduction | 3 |
| | Data Compositing | 4 |
| II. | MATERIALS AND METHODS | 4 |
| | Data Reduction | 4 |
| | Data Compositing | 7 |
| III. | RESULTS AND DISCUSSION | 8 |
| | Data Reduction | 8 |
| | Data Compositing | 14 |
| IV. | CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 24 |
| V. | BIBLIOGRAPHY | 25 |