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Introduction

An increasing number of remotely sensed data sources are available for detecting and characterizing forest disturbance and spatial pattern. As the information that is extracted from remotely sensed data is often a function of image characteristics, matching the appropriate data source to the disturbance target of interest requires knowledge of these image characteristics. Furthermore, an understanding of the implications of the dependencies between imagery selected, disturbance of interest, and change detection approach used, are required to facilitate the selection of an appropriate data source. The method used to capture the disturbance information must also be considered within the context that not all methods inherently support all data sources and vice versa. The goals of this Chapter are to: identify the key issues for consideration during the data selection process; highlight how these issues impact upon the successful detection and characterization of forest disturbance and spatial pattern; and finally, review the range of methods available for detecting forest disturbances and emphasize the link between these methods and the selection of an appropriate data source.

Background

Observations of ecological disturbances have been acquired since remote sensing technologies first became available (Cohen and Goward, 2004). Since the invention of photography, it was apparent that images captured from the air provided important information on the spatial patterns on the Earth's surface (Colwell, 1960), and quickly became critical for resource managers. As early as the 1910s for example, barely a decade after the first aerial remote sensing platforms were developed, the synoptic view afforded by aerial sensors benefited a number of disciplines including forestry and ecology (Spurr, 1948). During the 1920s, improved camera systems for producing vertical aerial photographs with minimal distortion were developed (Thompson and Gruner, 1980). As a result, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) began to systematically photograph agricultural lands throughout the United States in the 1930s (Rango et al., 2002). By 1950, aerial photography was a standard tool for resource managers concerned with mapping land cover and land use change (Goward and Williams, 1997). Aerial coverage has continued to the present day to provide an invaluable resource to examine the dynamics of spatial pattern (Rango et al., 2002; Goslee et al., 2003).

Space based remote sensing of the Earth’s surface began from Explorer 6 in 1959 and the TIROS NOAA series of satellites began in 1960 (Goward and Williams, 1997). Since then, imagery from the Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer (AVHRR), and more recently from the Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectrometer (MODIS) sensors on TERRA and AQUA, have made routine mapping of global vegetation possible (Running et al., 1999, Cohen et al., 2002). However, these systems are principally designed for global coverage with low spatial resolution (approximately 1 to 5 km), which is generally too coarse for monitoring localized or regional disturbance events (Cohen et al., 2002). Imagery at much finer spatial scales, at around 80 m, has been available since the launch of Landsat-1 in 1972 (Cohen and Goward, 2004). Since then, a family of Landsat satellites have orbited the Earth, with many other similar successful satellite programs initiated by other countries including France, India, Japan and Russia (Stoney, 2004). Successful launches of both commercial and government satellites programs over the past five
years (and those planned for the next five years) have resulted in a large increase in the number of available satellite based imaging sensors. In 2005, there were expected to be up to 30 satellites with spatial resolutions ranging from 0.3 m – 2.5 km (Stoney, 2004).

As of the writing of this Chapter, Landsat-5 is experiencing some technical difficulties and Landsat-7 is not operating as envisioned, with a scan line corrector problem requiring the production of mosaicked image products. The status of the Landsat sensors, both operationally and politically, is changing rapidly. While continuity of the collection Landsat-like data is enshrined as public policy, the continuity of the actual Landsat sensor program is currently not clear. Efforts are underway to ensure some form of data collection of Landsat-like data. The actual sensor, timing, and mechanisms for this to happen are currently not known. Current information can be found at: http://landsat.usgs.gov/.

Selection of Remotely Sensed Imagery

As discussed by Linke et al. (Chapter 1, This volume), mapping and monitoring landscape disturbance is highly scale dependent - both spatially and temporally. As a result, the landscape patterns and processes that are discernable with any particular remotely sensed image source are dependant on the target of interest (e.g., single tree versus stand replacing disturbance) and the spatial, spectral, radiometric, and temporal characteristics of the image source (Turner, 1989; Perera and Euler, 2000). These image characteristics must be considered during the data selection process along with the methods and techniques that may be used to detect the change. In addition, the information requirements of the end user must also be considered. For example, an end user interested in the total area disturbed by fire in a single year may be satisfied with a simple binary classification indicating areas of fire and no fire. Conversely, an end user interested in forest succession following a fire event may require more detailed information on fire extent, as well as species composition and abundance, in order to monitor the pattern of forest succession over time. Image characteristics will dictate which image source is most appropriate for the given information need.

The characteristics of a remotely sensed image are often collectively referred to as the image resolution and relate to the size of individual pixels or picture elements, the overall spatial extent of the image, the time interval of acquisition, the level of detail or discrimination the sensor is capable of providing, the region(s) of the electromagnetic spectrum in which the sensor collects data, and the bit depth of the sensor. Each of these image characteristics and the interactions between these image characteristics, are addressed in the following sections. In addition, the implications of these characteristics for data selection, in the context of forest disturbance, are discussed.

Spatial Resolution

The spatial resolution of a remotely sensed scene provides an indication of the size of the minimum area that can be resolved by a detector at an instant in time (Strahler et al., 1986; Woodcock and Strahler, 1987). In the case of aerial photography, the spatial resolution is based on the film speed or size of the silver halide crystal (Nelson et al., 2001). In the case of digital sensors, an instrument that has a spatial resolution of 30 m is technically able to resolve any 30
m by 30 m area on the landscape as one single reflectance response. The information content of a pixel is tied to the relationship between the spatial resolution and the size of the objects of interest on the Earth’s surface. If trees are the objects of interest and a sensor with a 30 m spatial resolution is used, many objects (trees) per pixel can be expected, which limits the utility of the data for characterizing the individual trees. However, if forest stands are the objects of interest, and an image source with a 30 m pixel is used, a number of pixels will represent each forest stand, resulting in an improved potential for characterization of stand level attributes. This relationship between pixels and objects is fully characterized by Woodcock and Strahler (1987). The area that is covered by a single remotely sensed image (spatial extent or image footprint) is principally a function of the sensor swath width or field of view (Lillesand and Kiefer, 2000; Richards and Jia, 1999). Instruments with a low spatial resolution typically have the capacity to capture larger areas. For example, Landsat Thematic Mapper (considered a medium spatial resolution sensor) images have a spatial extent of 185 by 185 km with a spatial resolution of 30 m (for most of its spectral bands). Conversely, the NOAA AVHRR sensor has a much larger swath width and subsequently covers a greater area (2394 by 2394 km) with a spatial resolution of between 1.1 and 6 km (Richards and Jia, 1999), with the range in spatial resolution due to off-nadir (i.e. not directly beneath the sensor, but at an angle) scanning during data capture.

The generalized description of spatial resolution indicates an expectation of the nature of the information that is captured (Woodcock and Strahler, 1987). High spatial resolution data may provide detailed information on objects as finite as individual trees, streams or buildings; however, the image footprint or spatial extent is also typically limited (e.g., 10 by 10 km), often precluding use of this data for large area studies for both feasibility and cost reasons (Wulder et al., 2004a). Historically, medium spatial resolution sensors (such as Landsat TM and SPOT multi-spectral imagery) have provided the optimal resolution for characterizing large areas with comprehensive coverage while still maintaining an ability to describe landscape level phenomena, such as land cover change and regional disturbance (Woodcock et al., 2001; Franklin and Wulder, 2002). Further, the nature of the patterns identified from high spatial resolution data differ from those captured from lower spatial resolution data (e.g., trees versus stands). Gergel (Chapter 7, This volume) addresses issues related to the investigation of high spatial resolution data with landscape pattern metrics. Traditional trends in landscape pattern metrics found when analyzing Landsat or lower spatial resolution data will not necessarily be found when analyzing higher spatial resolution data, as the patterns present represent different surface or vegetation characteristics.

Figure 2.1 provides an example of how the information content of a remotely sensed image can vary with spatial resolution. The first panel in this Figure (A) is a Landsat-7 ETM+ multispectral image representing an area of approximately eight square kilometres. With the 30 m spatial resolution of the ETM+ data, broad scale features such as forest stands, harvest blocks, and roads are discernable. A sub-area representing approximately 0.5 km² is shown in the two panels below (B and C). Panel B is a portion of a multispectral QuickBird image with a spatial resolution of 2.7 m. At this spatial resolution individual trees can be identified. In the final panel (C), a portion of a digital aerial photograph with a 0.30 m pixel is shown, where individual trees can be resolved with greater detail than in the QuickBird image, and furthermore, the attributes associated with these individual trees can be characterized. For example, trees damaged by mountain pine beetle appear red in the digital photo (note that the same area of red-attack
damage is also present in the QuickBird image).

LIDAR (light detection and ranging) data represents the three-dimensional structure of the surface or vegetation canopy. LIDAR systems emit a pulse of laser infrared radiation and measure the time (and therefore distance) it takes for the pulse to reach, and then be reflected by the surface (Lefsky and Cohen, 2003). LIDAR data is typically collected as single points or profiles and therefore, the land surface is sampled rather than fully imaged, resulting in non-contiguous data. Most airborne systems have a point spacing of between 1 to 5 m depending on the system configuration and flying altitude and speed, which may be customized to meet user needs (Lim et al., 2003). These points are, in turn, processed to represent ground and canopy elevation surfaces.

When selecting a data source for forest disturbance mapping, spatial resolution will be a key decision point. Table 2.1 outlines the optimal applications associated with different spatial resolutions. Generally, broad scale phenomena (covering large areas, for which general trends are of interest) are best characterized by low spatial resolution imagery (e.g., for monitoring trends in vegetation cover across North America). Conversely, high spatial resolution data is more appropriate for investigating disturbances that require a greater level of spatial detail, such as tree level disturbances. For example, Figure 2.1 demonstrates that high spatial resolution data such as QuickBird or aerial photography would be required to capture tree-level damage caused by the mountain pine beetle.

The spatial extent of data sources must also be considered in conjunction with data costs. Low spatial resolution data sources typically cover larger spatial extents and are less expensive; therefore, the per unit cost for these data sources is less than medium or high resolution data sources. Conversely, high spatial resolution data sources generally have smaller spatial extents and higher per unit costs. In addition, high spatial resolution data also present additional challenges for project logistics: image files tend to be large and cumbersome to store, manipulate, and process. Furthermore, the increased spectral variability of high spatial resolution imagery can confound many commonly used image classification methods (Wulder et al., 2004a). Careful thought must therefore be given to the information need and the spatial resolution, as higher spatial resolution data will not necessarily provide better information.

**Temporal resolution**

The temporal resolution provides an indication of the time it takes for a sensor to return to the same location on the Earth's surface. The revisit time is a function of the satellite orbit, image footprint, and the capacity of the sensor to image off-nadir. The timing of image acquisition should be linked to the target of interest. Some disturbance agents may have specific bio-windows (e.g., fire, defoliating or phloem feeding insects) during which imagery must be collected in order to capture the required information (Wulder et al., 2004b), while other disturbances may be less specific (e.g., harvest). For ongoing programs designed to monitor forest change before and after a disturbance event, the acquisition of images should occur in the same season over a series of years (known as anniversary dates). Anniversary dates are critical to ensure the spectral responses of the vegetation remain relatively consistent over successive years (Lunetta et al., 2004). In addition, a reduction in image quality may also occur due to non-optimal sun-angles and reduced illumination conditions as a result, off-year imagery is typically
preferred over off-season imagery for remote sensing mapping applications (Wulder et al. 2004c). For some applications, however, the capacity to incorporate temporal resolution can be advantageous. For example, analysis of vegetation at both leaf-on and leaf-off times can provide important information on the pattern of understorey vegetation and non-deciduous canopy condition (Dymond et al., 2002). Temporal resolution of airborne sensors is less critical as, in many cases, image collection is undertaken on demand, often coincident with insect outbreaks or fires (Stone et al., 2001).

There are often trade-offs between image spatial and temporal resolution that have implications for data selection. Generally, high spatial resolution imagery, has smaller footprint (or image) size and it takes longer for the satellite to revisit a location on the Earth’s surface at nadir than broader scale imagery. However many high resolution sensors have the capacity to tilt or position the sensor at an angle thereby allowing locations on adjacent swaths to be acquired. This results in satellites such as IKONOS and QuickBird (whose revisit times to have short revisit times (varying from 1 to 3.5 days depending on latitude of target location) however images will be acquired be off-nadir . Medium resolution satellites such as Landsat revisit the same location once every 16 days. The relationship between spatial resolution, footprint (or image) size, for other medium spatial resolution systems is presented in Figure 2.2.

Spectral Resolution

Spectral resolution provides an indication of the number and the width of the spectral wavelengths captured by a particular sensor. The spectral resolution of standard black and white aerial photography is known as panchromatic, and spans the complete visible portion of the electromagnetic spectrum, along with some portion of the near infrared spectral wavelengths, with a single image band or channel. Sensors with more bands and narrower spectral widths are described as having an increased spectral resolution. Currently, most operational remote sensing systems have a small number of broad spectral channels: Landsat ETM+ data has seven spectral bands in the reflective portion of the electromagnetic spectrum and one band in the thermal-infrared region. Hyperspectral data (e.g., instruments with more than 200 narrow spectral bands) are becoming more widely available (Vane and Goetz, 1993) both on space borne (such as the HYPERION sensor on the EO-1 platform) and airborne platforms such as HyMap (Cocks et al., 1998), casi (Anger et al., 1994), and the NASA Advanced Airborne Visible/Infrared Imaging Spectrometer (AVIRIS) (Vane et al., 1993). The width and locations of these bands along the electromagnetic spectrum determine their suitability for forest disturbance applications. For example, a subtle spectral response, such as foliage discolouration, might manifest in a very specific region of the electromagnetic spectrum and may therefore be more effectively detected with a hyperspectral instrument, whereas a dramatic change, such as clearcutting, is discernible in a wide range of spectral wavelengths.

Remote sensing imagery is often categorised as either active or passive. Passive, or optical, remotely sensed data are collected by sensors sensitive to light in the 400 – 2500 nm region of the electromagnetic spectrum (encompassing the visible, near-infrared, shortwave, mid- and long- infrared regions of the spectrum), which includes detection of reflected light and temperature (such as weather or meteorological satellites). Passive remotely sensed data are the type most commonly used for vegetation studies and forest disturbance applications. Examples include aerial photography, Landsat, SPOT, IKONOS, and QuickBird.
Active remote sensing systems are characterized as those that emit energy, in one form or another, and then measure the return rate or amount of that energy, back to the instrument. These active sensors can therefore operate under expanded meteorological conditions, as the sun's illumination is not required. Microwave and LIDAR systems are examples of active sensors that provide the energy illuminating the surface, and record the backscattered radiation from the target (Lefsky and Cohen, 2003). The most common implementation for microwave sensors is synthetic aperture radar (or SAR), which utilises microwave wavelengths of 1 mm to 1 m, about two thousand to two million times the wavelength of green light (500 nm) (Lefsky and Cohen, 2003). The choice of active versus passive systems for forest disturbance mapping will depend on the information need. Since active sensors can operate regardless of weather, they may be most effectively used in areas where there is perpetual cloud cover (e.g., tropical rainforests). Terrestrial LIDAR sensors typically capture a single spectral band, often between 900 and 1064 nm (Lefsky and Cohen, 2003). New disturbance mapping opportunities are enabled through the repeated collection of LIDAR data representing differing time periods, such as monitoring of forest gap dynamics and growth (St-Onge and Vepakomma, 2004).

Radiometric Resolution

Radiometric resolution provides an indication of the actual information content of an image and is often interpreted as the number of intensity levels that a sensor can use to record a given signal (Lillesand and Kiefer, 2000). The finer the radiometric resolution of a sensor, the more sensitive it is to detecting small differences in reflected or emitted energy. Thus, if a sensor uses 8 bits to record data, there would be $2^8 = 256$ digital values available, ranging from 0 to 255. However, if only 4 bits were used, then only $2^4 = 16$ values ranging from 0 to 15 would be available, resulting in reduced radiometric resolution. Most low and medium resolution remotely sensed data commercially available are 8-bit. High resolution data such as QuickBird are 11-bit. In terms of data selection for forest disturbance, radiometric resolution is the least critical of all of the image characteristics considered in this Chapter, as the sensors available for mapping of land cover and dynamics typically have a minimum of 8 bits. Given the option, it is usually better to use data with a greater radiometric resolution; generally, users should receive data in the original bit format, and not data that have been resampled to a lower radiometric resolution.

Resolution interactions and implications

The variety of remote sensors onboard the array of satellites operated by public and private agencies that are currently orbiting the Earth and collecting data at various spatial, temporal, radiometric, and spectral resolutions, renders the compilation of an exhaustive list of remote sensing systems difficult. For a comprehensive listing of remote sensing instruments and missions, the reader is referred to Glackin and Peltzer (1999), as well as to sources on the internet, which provide additional details on existing and planned remote sensing systems (e.g., Stoney, 2004). Relevant attributes of the most common systems are summarized in Table 2.2, and an indication of commonly used sensors with a range of spatial and spectral characteristics is provided in Figure 2.3. When selecting an appropriate image source to capture forest disturbance information, the information need(s) of the end users must guide the selection of data with consideration of spatial, spectral, and temporal resolutions. Logistical issues, such as metadata, data storage, file manipulation, and data costs, must also factor into the decision.
Once the relative merits of spatial, temporal, spectral, and radiometric properties have been considered relative to the target and information need, an appropriate data source may be selected. Following data selection, a series of pre-processing steps are typically required to prepare the data for further analysis. The pre-processing requirements are particularly necessary when multiple dates of imagery are being used to characterize forest disturbance or change events in general. Radiometric and geometric processing methods are addressed in the following section.

Radiometric and Geometric Processing

Success in disturbance identification is dependent on robust radiometric and geometric pre-processing (Lu et al., 2004; Trietz and Rogan, 2004). Once the most appropriate remotely sensed imagery has been selected to monitor the disturbance and its spatial pattern, detection of this variation either spatially or temporally is only possible if changes in the phenomena of interest result in detectable changes in radiance, emittance, or backscatter (Smits and Annoni, 2000). Thus, it is critical that the change in signal is attributable to a real change in the land surface, rather than a change in non-surface factors such as atmospheric conditions, imaging and viewing conditions, or sensor degradation (Hame, 1988); radiometric processing is applied to image data to minimize the impacts of these factors on subsequent image analysis procedures. Similarly, the geometric matching of two or more scenes must be accurate, as image misregistration can have a large influence on the change detection results (Smits and Annoni, 2000). The following sections detail those processing steps that are required to prepare the imagery for further analysis.

Radiometric processing

Data, as acquired by a remote sensing instrument, is affected by many sources of radiometric error, and therefore requires some form of radiometric processing prior to the application of image analysis techniques are used to extract disturbance information (Peddle et al., 2003). A critical requirement for successful detection of disturbance and time series analysis is the correct derivation of the true change in radiometric response over time. In many portions of the electromagnetic spectrum, the atmosphere has a significant impact on the signal sensed by satellite or airborne sensors due to scattering and absorption by gas and aerosols (Song et al., 2001).

Approaches to radiometric correction are typically described as absolute or relative (or a mixture of both). Absolute methods involve extracting the reflectance of a target at the Earth's surface and require detailed information regarding the actual atmospheric conditions at time of overpass, such as water vapour content and aerosol optical thickness, to adjust the imagery using radiative transfer theory (Peddle et al., 2003). A limitation to absolute atmospheric correction methods is...
the requirement for detailed atmospheric data that are rarely routinely available at the location or
time of satellite overpass, especially when the analysis is retrospective. Relative radiometric
correction methods are designed to reduce atmospheric effects and variability between multiple
images, by using common features in the two images that have invariant spectral properties
(Chen et al., 2005). The choice of whether to use an absolute or relative radiometric correction
method depends on many factors and the reader is referred to Chen et al. (2005) and Song et al.
(2001) for a more detailed discussion on the relative merits of each approach. It should be noted
that some analysis methods have been developed using specific data types (e.g., ground surface
reflectance), and therefore, if the user intends to implement these methods, they must ensure that
the data are corrected to the appropriate level. The topics included in this Chapter cover
fundamental radiometric considerations: conversion of raw image values or digital numbers
(DN) to radiance; conversion of radiance values to reflectance; and normalizing imagery to
minimize the impact of different atmospheric or illumination conditions. A more thorough and
detailed discussion of radiometric processing considerations is provided by Peddle et al. (2003).

The methods described here, although generic in the sequence of steps that must be followed to
complete the correction, are somewhat specific to Landsat products due to the long history of
Landsat data usage. Research and methods for the radiometric processing of other sensors are
becoming increasingly available (e.g., Pagnutti et al., 2003; Wu et al., 2005). Conversion of the
sensor signal to surface reflectance requires that the raw digital numbers be first converted to
radiance and then to reflectance. Conversion to at-satellite radiance (also know as Top of
Atmosphere (TOA) is required if imagery from different sensors is to be compared (e.g., Landsat
TM and ETM+) and is achieved using the following equation (Markham and Barker, 1986):

\[
\text{Rad}_i = \text{DN}_i \times \text{Gain}_i + \text{Offset}_i
\]  

(2.1)

where \( i \): band number, for \( i = 1,2,3,4,5,7 \);

\( \text{Rad}_i \): TOA radiance of band \( i \);

\( \text{DN}_i \): DN of band \( i \);

\( \text{Gain}_i \): gain of band \( i \);

\( \text{Offset}_i \): offset of band \( i \).

Gains and offsets are provided in the header file for the imagery, or standard parameters specific
to the sensor of interest, are available from a variety of sources (e.g., Markham and Barker,
1986; Ekstrand, 1996; Huang et al., 2002).

These radiance values are then converted to reflectance using the following equation (Huang et
al., 2002).

\[
\text{Re}_i = (\text{Rad}_i \times \pi \times d^2)/(\text{ESUN}_i \times \sin(\theta))
\]  

(2.2)

where \( i \): band number, for \( i = 1,2,3,4,5,7 \);

\( \text{Re}_i \): TOA reflectance of band \( i \);

\( \text{Rad}_i \): TOA radiance of band \( i \);

\( d \): Earth-Sun distance in astronomical unit;

\( \text{ESUN}_i \): mean solar exoatmospheric irradiance of band \( i \);

\( \theta \): Sun elevation angle.
The Earth-Sun distance $d$ can be determined by a lookup table, based on the Julian day when the data was acquired (Irish, 2000). The mean solar exoatmospheric irradiances for Landsat-7 ETM+ bands are provided in Irish (2000), with information for other sensors also available (e.g., Pagnutti et al. 2003; Tuominen and Pekkarinen, 2005). The Sun elevation angle $\theta$ can be found either in the raw data header file, or calculated based on the time and date of data acquisition. This conversion to TOA reflectance is necessary to correct for variation caused by solar illumination differences, as well as cross-sensor differences in spectral bands.

Where multiple images are used for change detection, disparities between the different image dates may persist (even after conversion to TOA reflectance) as a result of different atmospheric conditions and viewing and illumination geometries. To reduce these disparities, images undergo a normalization step (Heo and Fitzhugh, 2000; Yang and Lo, 2000; Du et al., 2002; McGovern et al. 2002). A number of variations on the normalization technique exist; however, most require use of a set of reference sites that appear over the entire image sequence. The sites, also known as pseudo invariant features or PIFs (Schott et al., 1988), are generally well-defined spatial objects in the scene that are interpreted as spectrally homogenous and stable over time (Furby and Campbell, 2001). Both light and dark features can be used and often include lakes, mature even age forest, dunes, and roads. Equations are then derived for all spectral channels to ensure these spectral features remain consistent over a temporal sequence of images (Yang and Lo, 2000).

**Geometric Correction and Image Co-registration**

In its raw state, satellite imagery contains spatial distortions that are a function of the acquisition system (e.g., factors associated with the sensor platform such as viewing angle, orbit, altitude, and velocity), or a function of external factors (e.g., effects of the Earth's curvature, relief displacement, and deformations resulting from map projections). Some of these distortions are systematic and are routinely corrected by the data vendor before the data is distributed. Other distortions are more difficult to fix and require the use of models or mathematical functions (Toutin, 2003). The term geometric correction refers to the processes used to correct spatial distortions; geometric correction is required to align remotely sensed imagery with other data sources and to combine multiple images, either to mosaic multiple images over large areas, or co-register multiple images collected over the same location at different times. Geometric misregistration of images can be a significant source of error, and minimizing this error is a time consuming task when undertaking change detection or data fusion methods (Dai and Khorram, 1998). Typically, a desirable target for geometric registration is an error less than half a pixel. This ensures that misregistration does not introduce error into change detection results (Dai and Khorram, 1998; Igbokwe, 1999). It has been noted however that a misregistration, often reported as a root mean square error (RMSE), of less than one pixel can be difficult to obtain (Gong and Xu, 2003).

Generally, all geometric correction methods require the collection of ground control points (GCPs), which are points concurrently identified from a corrected source (e.g. basemap, corrected image) and an uncorrected image source. The differences in the X and Y positions of these points between these two sources are used to compensate for spatial distortions in the uncorrected image. In the case of orthorectification, the Z position (or elevation) is also used for the correction. A summary of geometric correction methods are provided in Table 2.3, while a
more detailed treatment of methods is provided by Toutin (2003; 2004). Geometric correction methods typically take one of two forms: parametric or non-parametric. Non-parametric methods are considered suitable for low resolution imagery, while parametric methods are necessary for high resolution imagery. In the context of mapping forest disturbance, geometric correction is critical if a change detection approach is used, and if the resulting disturbance information is to be integrated into other spatial databases.

**Methodologies for Disturbance Mapping:**
Once appropriate radiometric and geometric corrections have been applied, the image data is ready for analysis. The overriding objective when detecting landscape change and disturbances is to compare data from a series of points in time by (a) controlling all extrinsic factors caused by differences in variables that are not of interest and (b) assessing the real changes caused by the variable of interest (Lu et al., 2004). Therefore, as discussed in the previous section, minimising and removing factors such as atmospheric attenuation and scattering, illumination, viewing distortion, and poor co-registration is critical to ensure the observed change is real. A wide variety of detection algorithms and time series approaches have been developed to detect change and disturbances in imagery and selecting and implementing the most appropriate method is an important processes in change detection studies. A number of current reviews exist (Gong and Xu, 2003; Coppin et al., 2004; Lu et al., 2004). Singh (1989) defines 11 categories of change detection techniques that can broadly be grouped into five distinct approaches: (i) image algebra (differencing, subtraction or ratioing) of two or more images; (ii) regression or correlation where a model is developed that predicts or compares spectral responses of a series of images; (iii) statistical techniques such as the tasselled cap transformation (TCT) and principal component analysis (PCA) that computes statistical components that are then compared for temporal changes, (iv) classification comparisons where images are classified separately and the resulting classifications are compared; and (v) the increasing use of tools that analyse images and other datasets within a Geographic Information System (GIS). Each of these methods will be discussed in detail in the following sections.

**Image algebra**
The use of simple algebraic operations to assess levels of change and disturbance through a time series of images is a commonly applied, relatively easy, and straightforward technique. The approaches all have the common characteristic of selecting either constant or dynamic thresholds to determine through time, when and if a change has occurred. In this category of methods, two aspects are critical for the change detection results: selecting suitable image bands or vegetation indices, and selecting suitable thresholds to identify the changed areas (Lu et al., 2004). The most commonly applied index is the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI), which is the normalized ratio of the near infrared and red region of the spectrum (Eq. 2.4).

\[
NDVI = \frac{(NIR - R)}{(NIR + R)}
\]  

(2.4)

where \( R \): reflectance in the red and ; \( NIR \): reflectance in the near infrared;

In the near infrared region of the spectrum, within-leaf scattering is high and, as result, reflected radiation from the canopy is also high. Conversely, in the red component of the spectrum, high
absorption by pigments results in low radiation reflection. Consequently, changes in vegetation amount and cover, as well as the photosynthetic capacity of the vegetation, are typically positively related to an increase in the difference between near infrared and red radiation (Peterson and Running, 1989; Price and Bausch, 1995).

A number of additional indices are based on theory similar to NDVI, such as the Enhanced Vegetation Index (EVI) (Eq. 2.5), and specialty indices that incorporate the shortwave and mid-infrared spectral regions (such as the NDVIc (NDVI fire index) (Eq. 2.6) and the normalized burn ratio (NBR) (Key and Benson, 2005; Clark and Bobbe, Chapter 5, This volume; Hudak et al., Chapter 8, This volume) (Eq. 2.7)).

\[
EVI = G \ast \frac{NIR - R}{NIR + C_1 R - C_2 B + L} \tag{2.5}
\]

\[
NDVIc = \frac{(NIR - R)}{(NIR + R)} \ast [1 - \frac{(SWIR - SWIR_{min})}{(SWIR_{max} - SWIR_{min})}] \tag{2.6}
\]

\[
NBR = \frac{(NIR - SWIR)}{(NIR + SWIR)} \tag{2.7}
\]

where

- \(B\): reflectance in the blue;
- \(R\): reflectance in the red;
- \(NIR\): reflectance in the near infrared;
- \(SWIR\): reflectance in the short wave or mid-infrared spectral channels and
- \(G, C_1, C_2, L\) are user specified constants.

At the broad scale, Potter et al. (2003) utilised a sequence of long-term AVHRR monthly spectral vegetation indices from 1982 to 1999 to identify major global disturbance events. Monthly vegetation indices were compared to a derived 18-year long-term average. The majority of the disturbance events (predominantly fire related) occurred in tropical savannah, scrubland, or boreal forest ecosystems. The analysis concluded that nearly 9 Pg of carbon have been lost from the terrestrial ecosystem to the atmosphere as a result of large scale ecosystem disturbances. At the landscape scale, Nelson (1983) utilised the difference of the near infrared spectral channels from Landsat MSS to delineate areas of gypsy moth defoliation. Lyon et al. (1998) undertook a comparison of seven spectral indices from three different dates to detect land cover change and concluded that changes in NDVI provided the best detection of vegetation change. In addition to using Landsat data, imagery from other sensors can also be incorporated. For example Stow et al. (1990) found that ratioing red and near-infrared bands of a Landsat MSS–SPOT high resolution visible image (HRV) (XS) multi-temporal pairs produced substantially higher change detection accuracy (about 10% better) than ratioing similar bands of a Landsat MSS–Landsat TM multi-temporal pair (Lu et al., 2004).

**Image regression or correlation**

More advanced methods of change detection can include the use of geometric models, spectral mixture models, and biophysical parameter models. In these approaches, multi-date change is computed from physically based parameters such as leaf area index (LAI) or biomass values that are in turn, computed from reflectance values. These transformed variables are preferred over simple vegetation indices for facilitating the interpretation of change and the extraction of
vegetation information (Lu et al., 2004; Hall et al., Chapter 4, This volume). Adams et al. (1995) applied spectral linear unmixing approaches to extract spectral end-members including healthy vegetation, non-photosynthetic vegetation (NPV), exposed soil and shade, and then analyzed changes in these spectral members as surrogates for land-cover change. Rogan et al. (2002) applied a similar approach using Landsat imagery. Within a biophysical model framework, combinations of spectral bands, as well as other data such as climate can be used to assess disturbance and land cover change. For example, monitoring phenological patterns of vegetation and its subsequent change is possible using a range of techniques including measures of similarity (Coops and Walker, 1996), Fourier analysis (Andres et al., 1994), wavelet theory (Meyer, 1990) and harmonic analysis (Jakubauskas et al., 2001). Bennett (1979) provides a mathematical overview of spatial-time series analysis. With these techniques the emphasis is not only on temporal change but also on the shape characteristics of the temporal change. Lambin and Strahler (1994) used three indicators, vegetation indices, land surface temperature and spatial structure, derived from AVHRR, to detect land-cover change. Lawrence and Ripple (1999) utilized eight Landsat TM scenes to monitor changes in vegetation through time using fitted statistical models between each date to assess changes in overall vegetation cover. A key advantage of using these profile-based techniques that link with other datasets such as climate is that the full variation in the phenological cycle is resolved, as data are collected throughout the growing season. As a result, changes linked to seasonality can be separated from other land cover changes and disturbances. A disadvantage is that typically only coarse spatial resolution imagery has a high enough temporal frequency to develop the necessary temporal profiles. This limits the change categories that can be detected and monitored (Coppin et al., 2004), although some research has taken place using time series to monitor ecosystem disturbances at finer spatial resolutions (e.g. Coops et al., 1999; Rogan et al., 2002; Sawaya et al., 2003).

Statistical techniques

Rather than a simple ratio of spectral channels, more refined transformations of the input spectral bands have been promoted as a technique to extract information on vegetation disturbance. One advantage of statistical approaches is they reduce data redundancy between bands and emphasize different information in derived components (Lu et al., 2004). The most commonly applied techniques are based on principal component analysis (PCA) and the tasselled cap transformation (TCT) (Crist and Cicone, 1984). Whilst the use of principal components to derive multi-temporal change can be difficult to ascertain without a detailed understanding of the eigen structure of the data, the link between vegetative change and TCT has been shown to be generally more robust (Collins and Woodcock, 1996; Coppin et al., 2004). Simplistically, the TCT are guided and scaled PCA, which transform the Landsat bands into channels of known characteristics; soil brightness, vegetation greenness, and soil/vegetation wetness. Changes in these components over time can therefore reflect changes in the vegetation characteristics. Cohen et al. (1998) contrasted the brightness and greenness components of a TCT output to assess changes in forest biomass in the Pacific Northwest of the US from 1976-1991, and found harvest activity was detected in over 90 percent of the known clearcuts. As the wetness component contrasts the sum of the visible and near infrared bands with the longer infrared bands to estimate vegetation or soil moisture, it has been used with success to detect forest disturbances through time. The difference between wetness indices calculated for multiple dates (known as the enhanced wetness difference index or EWDI) has been used to discriminate partial harvesting with a per-pixel accuracy of approximately 71% (Franklin et al., 2000). This technique has also been applied by
Skakun et al. (2003) to detect red-attack damage caused by mountain pine beetle (*Dentroctonus ponderosa* Hopkins) in stands of lodgepole pine (*Pinus contorta*). Skakun et al. (2003) used multi-temporal Landsat ETM+ imagery that was corrected and processed using the TCT to obtain wetness components that were differenced to reveal spatial patterns of insect attack. Classification accuracy of red-attack damage based on this method ranged from 67% to 78%. In Figure 2.4, the use of TCT wetness to map mountain pine beetle red-attack damage is presented. Pixel based locations of insect attack are a single example of the types of information products that can be generated using this, or other, types of pixel based change detection approaches. The Landsat pixel based insect attack can be generalized to represent 1 ha grid cells or forest inventory polygons. These grid or polygon representations of red-attack damage enable the pixel-based information to be ingested by models or to be incorporated into forest inventory databases.

Coppin and Bauer (1994) also examined changes in forest cover through use of the TCT components as well as simple vegetation indices (such as NDVI) and found that changes identified the most important forest canopy change features and that these can be adequately expressed as a normalized difference. One key advantage of the TCT method, over other statistical methods such as PCA, and as highlighted through these studies, is that the transformations are independent of the image scenes, while PCA is dependent on the image scenes (Lu et al., 2004).

**Image classification**

As an alternative to monitoring changes in the spectral response of vegetation before and after a disturbance event, another common technique of monitoring vegetation disturbance and pattern is to automatically categorize all pixels in an image into a series of land cover classes or themes and then compare the size and extent of the classes. This process of image classification can be either guided by human interpretation (known as supervised classification) or based principally on the statistical distribution of the spectral classes in the image (known as unsupervised classification). Image classification formed the basis of research investigating the differences in the structure and function of anthropogenic versus natural disturbance regimes (Tinker et al., 1998). Although natural processes (such as fire and windthrow) alter forest pattern, the landscape patterns produced by these processes is generally different from disturbances due to forest harvesting and associated road building. A single Landsat scene was used to classify a number of vegetation land cover and disturbance types. Several landscape pattern metrics were derived for the landscape as a whole, and for the forest cover classes, and the relative effects of clearcutting and road building on the pattern of each watershed was examined. At both the landscape- and cover class-scales, clearcutting and road building resulted in increased fragmentation as represented by a distinct suite of landscape structural changes (Tinker et al., 1998; Mladenoff et al., 1993; White and Mladenoff, 1994).

A similar approach was adopted by Bresee et al. (2004) who utilized six images acquired from 1972 – 2001. A supervised classification was used to classify the six dominant land cover types in the area including two disturbance classes, non-forested bare ground and regenerating forest or shrub. Changes in the size, and degree of fragmentation, of each of the natural and disturbed land cover classes were then assessed over the 27-year period. Results indicated that changes in management objectives and natural disturbances have had a clear influence on landscape patterns
and composition in the region throughout the past 30 years. The presence and temporal variability of windthrow events, disease outbreaks, and changes in stumpage value all greatly influenced the composition and structure of the forest stands (Bresee et al., 2004).

Cohen et al. (2002) compared over 50 Landsat scenes in the Pacific Northwest to monitor changes in disturbance patterns due to harvesting and fire over the past 30 years. An unsupervised classification approach was used to label pixels as disturbed, undisturbed, or confused. A trajectory for each pixel was then determined through time to provide overall maps of disturbance of the area. The historical imagery and mapping of spectral classes representing forest disturbance indicated that harvest rates were lowest in the early 1970s, peaked in the late 1980s and then decreased again in the mid-1990s. By comparing managed and natural disturbance regimes through time, an understanding can be developed on the relative impact of management regimes on ecosystems (Cohen et al., 2002).

The comparison of two image classifications representing different dates to find change does however need to be undertaken with care, as the accuracy of each of the individual classifications effectively limiting the accuracy of the final change layer (Fuller et al., 2003). For instance, if two classifications were to be used to find a 17% change with 75% reliability, both source classifications would require an accuracy of approximately 97% (Fuller et al., 2003).

**GIS approaches**

The significant development of GIS and its widespread adoption in natural resource management, coupled with developments in modelling of terrain and climate, have resulted in the development and implementation of models that integrate remote sensing observations with other spatial datasets (Rogan and Miller, Chapter 5, This volume). The advantage of using GIS within a change detection analysis is the capacity to incorporate a range of data sources into each change detection application. Lo and Shipman (1990) used overlay techniques to detect urban development using multi-temporal aerial photography and to map quantitatively changes in land use. With the availability of different types of satellite imagery and the capacity to digitize and analysis maps, these GIS functions offer convenient tools for land-use and land cover (LULC) change detection studies (Lu et al., 2004), especially when the change detection involves long period or multi-scale land-cover change analysis (Petit and Lambin, 2001). This type of change detection, with its ability to combine multi-source datasets, is the focus of ongoing research into the integration of GIS and remote sensing techniques to better implementation of change detection analyses.

**Operational Considerations**

While the capability to monitor both vegetation disturbance and vegetation succession has been demonstrated with satellite and airborne image datasets (Foody et al., 1996), it is critical to recognise that disturbances not resulting in complete stand replacement (such as selective thinning) and successional processes that involve a slow change in species composition, can be difficult to detect and classify (Table 2.4). Forest disturbance can be characterized by type (e.g., phenological, fire, disease, etcetera), duration (e.g., days, months, years), spatial extent (e.g., tree, stand, watershed), rate (e.g., slow, medium, fast), and magnitude (e.g., small, medium,
large) of the disturbance. The interactions of these elements for a given disturbance combine to suggest the type of imagery that should be selected, the date range over which the images should span, and the area of coverage required.

The type of change (as identified in Table 2.4) has an influence on likelihood of detection using remote sensing image-based change detection procedures. Stand replacement disturbances (such as wildfire, clearcut logging) are more likely to be clearly detected due to both their large visible extents and large change in vegetation structure and function (Cohen et al., 2002). In Figure 2.5 a relationship between the severity (or magnitude) and the accuracy that may be expected is portrayed. The notion is that subtle changes are more difficult to detect and map than dramatic changes. For instance, the removal of 10% of the stand volume to a partial harvest is more difficult to detect and map than a 40 ha clearcut, resulting in lower mapped attribute accuracy, or a lower detection likelihood. As a result, the expected accuracy when mapping changes in forest structure through partial harvesting is lower than when mapping clearcutting. The theory is supported through selected references included with the Figure 2.5. The size (extent) of the disturbance also has an impact on the detectability, as a function of the relationship between the spatial resolution and the objects of interest.

Following any classification, or feature identification, some form of accuracy assessment is recommended, and requisite statistics for accuracy estimates should be calculated (Stehman and Czaplewski, 1998). It is important that independent training and validation datasets are used for the assessment of accuracy (Stehman, 1997). The data-types that are commonly used are field and air photographs, other forms of purpose collected data, and questioning or participation of knowledgeable stakeholders. The types of errors that emerge are characterized as either commission (falsely mapped changes) or omission (missed changes). The use of non-independent data will typically yield a biased accuracy assessment (Rochon et al., 2003). Alternatively, if there is a lack of other independent observations with which to assess the accuracy of the output, statistical methods such as bootstrapping can help ensure an unbiased estimate of the accuracy is developed. It is also acknowledged that the collection and use of training and validation data that reflect landscape changes can be problematic, due to logistical and cost reasons. When mapping a single attribute of landscape disturbance, the collection of training and validation data are simplified by the number of classes under consideration; in this case, categorical transitions are from non-disturbed forest to some pre-identified disturbance state, such as a harvest or insect attack. Analyses that are capturing a more broad range of changes require training and validation data that represent the full range of categorical transitions that are, or are expected, to occur.

The accuracy assessment of the results of remote sensing change detection applications can be problematic due to the nature of the validation, as it can be based upon the process or the resultant products. The type, magnitude, and extent of the change (as presented in Table 2.4 and Figure 2.5) combine to influence the efficacy of the change detection approach. The nature of the change detection approach, and the types of data used, can also influence the ability of the analyst to capture the changes, and the portrayal of the accuracy results. Operational limitations to validation are acknowledged, leading to an understanding that there is not a single best practice for the training and accuracy assessment of change detection results (Stehman et al., 2003).
Conclusions

In summary, when developing and applying remotely sensed time series data to assess forest change and disturbance, users should consider a range of important issues:

- Ensure the temporal and spatial scale of the disturbance phenomena being monitored is well matched to the spatial, temporal, radiometric, and spectral resolution of the chosen remotely sensed imagery. In addition, ensure the data source can provide the information that the end user requires (e.g. a simple binary map showing disturbance areas versus a more complex product).

- Effective pre-processing is critical to effective forest disturbance detection and mapping. Once the imagery has been selected it is crucial that the imagery is (or has been) calibrated to ensure that an observed change in signal is attributable to ‘true’ change in the land surface, rather than a change due to non-surface factors such as different atmospheric conditions, imaging and viewing conditions, or sensor degradation. If multiple images are used (e.g., time series), the images must be spatially aligned precisely. High quality geometric matching of the images is important to ensure that spurious change detection results do not occur.

- A variety of image processing techniques exists to analyse change and detect disturbance regimes in remotely sensed observations. The method should be considered at the data selection stage, as not all data support all methods and vice versa. Select the most appropriate method (e.g. established or new spectral indices, statistical based methods, image classification, or modelling) based on the desired outcome and level of complexity associated with the information needs of the end user.

- The increased use of GIS, coupled with developments in modelling of terrain and climate, has resulted in increasing interest in integrating changes in the spectral response with other spatial datasets within process-based modelling approaches. These models are providing useful information at regional and continental scales on ecological, hydrological, and physiological processes.

- Finally, some description or documentation of the accuracy of the disturbance or change mapping is required to provide users with an understanding of the reliability or limitations of the products produced. The description of the results of the change procedure can be heuristic or systematic and quantitative. The user can take the accuracy description and use this to guide the confidence placed upon the change product for a given application.
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Figure 2.1. Illustration of differing information content for three images with differing spatial resolution located near Merritt, British Columbia, Canada. Panel A is an approximately 8 km² area of 30 m spatial resolution Landsat 7 ETM+ multispectral imagery (Path 46 / Row 25) collected on August 11, 2001. The 0.05 km² focus area in Panel A is represented in Panel B and C. Panel B is 2.4 m spatial resolution QuickBird multispectral imagery collected on July 17, 2004. Panel C is a digital ortho-image with a spatial resolution of 30 cm, collected on August 22, 2003.

Figure 2.2. Comparison of spatial footprint and revisit time of current medium spatial resolution satellites (Satellites and sensors listed in more detail in Table 2.2).

Figure 2.3. Spatial resolution and approximate spectral resolution of multispectral sensors commonly used for vegetation mapping. Shaded blocks represent different spectral bands. Blocks of narrower width tend to indicate a sensor with greater spectral sensitivity.

Figure 2.4. Illustration of TCT wetness difference image with pixel level insect infestation locations noted in yellow. Spatial information layers can be developed from the pixel based infestation locations, such as Panel B. showing the pixel-based disturbance information aggregated as a proportion on a per hectare basis, and Panel C, where the pixel-based disturbance is summed as an area estimate in hectares on a forest inventory polygon basis.

Figure 2.5. A theoretical representation of the increase in accuracy and decrease in confidence intervals (assuming equal samples sizes) associated with forest disturbance detection, as disturbances on the forest landscape become more severe (e.g., increase in size) and/or more contiguous. Disturbances that are small and heterogeneous over the landscape, such as defoliation or partial harvesting, are generally more difficult to detect with remotely sensed data (depending on the spatial resolution of the data). Furthermore, the spectral variability associated with these disturbances is greater, making repeat detection of these non-stand replacing disturbances less probable (i.e., the precision of these estimates is low). Conversely, larger and more spatially contiguous disturbances are generally mapped with greater consistency and greater accuracy, hence the narrowing of the confidence intervals for these stand replacing disturbances.
Table 2.1. Relationship between scale and spatial resolution in satellite-based land cover mapping programs (adapted from Franklin and Wulder, 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPATIAL RESOLUTION</th>
<th>NATURE OF SUITABLE FOREST DISTURBANCE TARGETS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Disturbances that occur over 100s or 1000s of metres (small scale); detectable with sensors such as GOES, NOAA AVHRR, EOS MODIS, SPOT VEGETATION.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Disturbances that occur over 10s or 100s of metres (medium scale); detectable with sensors such as Landsat, SPOT, IRS, JERS, ERS, Radarsat and Shuttle platforms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Disturbances that occur over scales of centimetres to metres (large scale); detectable with aerial remote sensing platforms (e.g., photography), IKONOS, QuickBird.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2. Characteristics of low, medium, and high spatial resolution sensors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENSOR</th>
<th>FOOTPRINT (km²)</th>
<th>SPATIAL RESOLUTION (m) (*)</th>
<th>SPECTRAL RESOLUTION (nm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOW RESOLUTION SENSORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAA 17 (AVHRR)</td>
<td>2940</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>500-1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOT 4 (VGT)</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>430-1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra (MODIS)</td>
<td>2330</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>366-14385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDIUM RESOLUTION SENSORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landsat-5 (TM)</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>450-2350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landsat-7 (ETM+)</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>30 (MS / SWIR); 15 (pan)</td>
<td>450-2350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOT 2 (HRV)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20 (MS); 10 (pan)</td>
<td>500-890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOT 4 (HRVIR)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>500-1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOT 5 (HRG)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10 (MS); 20 (SWIR)</td>
<td>500-1730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRS (RESOURCESAT-1)</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>520-1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra (ASTER)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>530-1165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO-1 (HYPERION)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>433-2350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH RESOLUTION SENSORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orbview-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 (MS); 1 (pan)</td>
<td>450-900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QuickBird-2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>2.44 (MS); 0.8 (pan)</td>
<td>450-900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IKONOS</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>4 (MS); 1 (pan)</td>
<td>450-850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* MS = multispectral, SWIR = shortwave infrared, pan = panchromatic
Table 2.3. A summary of geometric correction methods (modified after Toutin, 2004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>SUITABLE APPLICATIONS/ LIMITATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2D polynomial functions   | • Methods commonly applied when a classic geometric correction is done.  
• Do not require any \textit{a priori} information about the sensor, and therefore, do not reflect the source of distortions in the image.  
• 1st order polynomials correct for translation in both axes, a rotation, scaling in both axes and an obliquity.  
• 2nd order polynomials additionally correct for torsion and convexity in both axes.  
• 3rd order polynomial corrects for additional distortions, which do not necessarily correspond to any physical reality of the image acquisition system 3rd order polynomial functions introduce errors in the relative pixel positioning in ortho-images. |
|                           | Limited to images with few or small distortions.  
• Most suitable for nadir viewing imagery, covering small areas, over flat terrain.  
• Not recommended when precise geometric positioning is required.  
• Not suitable for multi-source/multi-format data integration and in high relief areas.  
• Requires numerous, regularly distributed GCPs.  
• Sensitive to error, not robust or consistent.  
• Correct locally at GCP locations only.                                                                                         |------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| NON-PARAMETRIC            | 3D polynomial functions  
• An extension of 2D methods and is the method typically used when a traditional orthorectification is complete.  
• Used when the parameters of the acquisition system are unknown.                                                                                                                                          | Limitations similar to 2D polynomials (above).  
• Most suitable for small images.                                                                                                      |------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                           | 3D rational functions  
• Used to approximate a model previously determined with a rigorous 3D parametric function; or, to determine (via least-squares adjustment), the coefficients of the polynomial function.                                                                                     | Have similar issues as 3D polynomial functions.  
• Should not be used with raw data or large size images.  
• Use with small, georeferenced or geocoded images.  
• Best choice amongst non-parametric methods.                                                                                          |------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| PARAMETRIC                | 3D parametric functions  
• Models the distortion of the platform, the Earth, and the cartographic projection.                                                                                                                                         | Depends on sensor, platform.  
• Most suitable method for high resolution imagery.                                                                                         |------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
Table 2.4. Major types of forest change, their duration, spatial extent, rate (on a daily basis), and magnitude (After Gong and Xu, 2003).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF CHANGE</th>
<th>TIME LAPSE (DURATION)</th>
<th>SPATIAL EXTENT</th>
<th>DISTURBANCE SEVERITY</th>
<th>RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phenological</td>
<td>Days – months</td>
<td>All levels</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration</td>
<td>Days – decades</td>
<td>Individual – stand</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climatic adaptation</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>All levels</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind throw / flooding</td>
<td>Minutes – hours</td>
<td>Individual – stand</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Medium – fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Minutes – days</td>
<td>All levels</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease</td>
<td>Days – years</td>
<td>All levels</td>
<td>Small – large</td>
<td>Slow – medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insect attack</td>
<td>Days – years</td>
<td>All levels</td>
<td>Small – large</td>
<td>Slow – fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortality</td>
<td>Days – years</td>
<td>All levels</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Slow – fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Stand – watershed</td>
<td>Small – large</td>
<td>Slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silviculture (Thinning / pruning)</td>
<td>Days</td>
<td>Stand – watershed</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearcutting</td>
<td>Days</td>
<td>Stand – watershed</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>Days – decades</td>
<td>Stand – watershed</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Fast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Table 2.1: Wavelength (µm) and Sensor Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spatial Resolution (m)</th>
<th>B 0.4-0.5</th>
<th>G 0.5-0.6</th>
<th>R 0.6-0.7</th>
<th>NIR 0.7-0.8</th>
<th>0.8-0.9</th>
<th>0.9-1.0</th>
<th>SWIR 1.0-1.15</th>
<th>1.65-1.75</th>
<th>MIR 2.0-2.1</th>
<th>2.1-2.2</th>
<th>2.2-2.3</th>
<th>2.3-2.4</th>
<th>Sensor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CASI&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 or 2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>QUICKBIRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IKONOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ASTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SPOT HRVIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ETM+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hyperion&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> CASI channels programmable in size; >2nm width depending on application (Anger et al., 1994)

<sup>b</sup> Hyperion collects 220 bands of spectral data over the 400 to 2500 nm spectral range.
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Figure 2.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Stand Replacement Disturbance</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Accuracy Level</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defoliation</td>
<td>42 – 58%</td>
<td>Heikkila et al., 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial cut</td>
<td>55 – 80%</td>
<td>Wilson and Sader, 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial cut</td>
<td>55% - 70%</td>
<td>Franklin et al., 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Cut</td>
<td>55% - 80%</td>
<td>Jin and Sader, 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stand Replacing Disturbance</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Accuracy Level</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>74 – 98%</td>
<td>Wright Parmenter et al., 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearcut, wildfire</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>Cohen et al., 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>Miller and Yool, 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearcut</td>
<td>79 – 96%</td>
<td>Wilson and Sader, 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearcut</td>
<td>&gt; 90%</td>
<td>Cohen et al., 1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>