

# BRDF / Albedo REPORT

①

## ATBD Concerns

- Algorithm too complex & risky
- High processing load
- Combining spatial, spectral, two-instrument data not well specified
- Cloud problems
- Atmospheric correction circularity problem
- Collateral data needs

Revised Approach: Semi Empirical Models (Wanner)

Topographic Input: (Muller)

clouds EDC 1-Km Prototyping: (Strahler .... Meyer)

Atmospheric Correction: (Strahler ... Vermote)

Validation: (Strahler, Muller)

VI Inputs: (Dialoguel Alfredo)

## BRDF/Albedo, Cont.

### EDC Linkages

#### Clouds

- Dave Meyer reports 4-8 looks in 30 day period w/ AVHRR in midwest test site
- Li @ CCRS reports cloud screening takes out 70% of AVHRR observations in Canada
- Muller anticipates some cloud cover studies using GAC / CLAVR
- Conclusion: Possible 15-day or longer BRDF period; possibly sliding
- Note: Lony & Roujean successfully did 30-day sliding fit to Roujean model

#### Albedo

- Dave Meyer developing techniques to do AVHRR Albedo
- Plans to try our semiempirical models (as well as others)
- Developed robust estimation technique so some cloud-influenced measurements can be used.

## BRDF/ALBEDO, CONT

3

### Atmospheric Correction

- Resolve circularity with 1-pass iteration
- Procedure: (proposed by Eric Vermote)
  - Retrieve, archive Lambertian surface reflectances
  - Include atmospheric params:  $\tau$ ,  $t$ ,  $s$ ,  $\bar{\rho}$
  - Extract BRDF (semiempirical fit)
  - Use BRDF & atmo. params to calculate new reflectances
  - Fit final BRDF
  - (MISR is already well-corrected)

### Validation

- Algorithm Development
  1. Revisit fit of semiempirical models to Kimes's V&B datasets
  2. Fit semiempirical models to ASAS data
  3. Fit semiempirical models to AVHRR datasets:  $20 \times 20$  &  $100 \times 100$  window datasets; AFGL New England composite.
- Field testing & beyond ... Muller

# MODIS BRDF/albedo output format

- per pixel 3 sets :
- best-fit model
  - (• 2nd-best model)
  - always modified Walthall m.

- per set :
- modeltype , RMSE
  - quality flags : overall quality  
goodness of fit  
goodness over bands  
spread of view angles  
spread of sun angles
  - history flags : overall history  
stability in time of model choice  
stability in time of parameters found
  - parameters for each band
  - white sky albedo : spectral,  
 $< 0.7 \mu\text{m}$ ,  $> 0.7 \mu\text{m}$ , all bands
  - black sky albedo : polynomial  
parameters for  $\theta_s$ -dependence,  
spectral,  $< 0.7 \mu\text{m}$ ,  $> 0.7 \mu\text{m}$ , all bands

once every 9 days .... 1 km resolution

## Example:

Savannah: grass + some trees

⇒ expected:  $K_{vol} =$  Ross - thin  
 $K_{geo} =$  Li - sparse

⇒

$$BRDF = f_{iso}$$

$$+ f_{vol} \cdot \left\{ \frac{(\pi/2 - \xi) \cos \xi + \sin \xi}{\cos \theta_i \cos \theta_v} - \frac{\pi}{2} \right\}$$

$$+ f_{geo} \cdot \left\{ \theta - \frac{1}{\cos \theta'_i} - \frac{1}{\cos \theta'_v} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{(1 + \cos \xi')}{\cos \theta'_v} \right\}$$

where  $\xi$  = phase angle,  $\cos \xi = \cos \theta_i \cos \theta_v + \sin \theta_i \sin \theta_v \cos \phi$   
 $\theta$  = overlap area =  $\frac{1}{\pi} (t - \sin t \cos t) \cdot (\frac{1}{\cos \theta_i} + \frac{1}{\cos \theta_v})$   
 $\cos t = \frac{h}{b} (D^2 + (\tan \theta_i \tan \theta_v \sin \phi)^2)^{1/2} \cdot (\frac{1}{\cos \theta_i} + \frac{1}{\cos \theta_v})$   
 $D = (\tan^2 \theta_i + \tan^2 \theta_v - 2 \tan \theta_i \tan \theta_v \cos \phi)^{1/2}$   
 $\tan \theta' = \frac{b}{r} \tan \theta$

$\frac{b}{r}$ : crown shape →  $\frac{b}{r} = 0.5, 1.0, 4.0$   
oblate round prolate

$\frac{h}{b}$ : relative tree size →  $\frac{h}{b} = 1.0, 2.0, 3.0$  short... tall

Ross - thin + Li - sparse - oblate - tall  $\xrightarrow{\text{Inversion}}$   $f_{iso}, f_{vol}, f_{geo}$

# Semi-empirical models

$$\text{BRDF}(\lambda, \theta_i, \theta_v, \phi) = f_{\text{iso}}(\lambda) + f_{\text{geo}}(\lambda) \cdot K_{\text{geo}} + f_{\text{vol}}(\lambda) \cdot K_{\text{vol}}$$

- Parameters  $f_{\text{iso}}$ ,  $f_{\text{geo}}$ ,  $f_{\text{vol}}$  for each band
  - Kernels  $K_{\text{vol}}(\theta_i, \theta_v, \phi)$ ,  $K_{\text{geo}}(\theta_i, \theta_v, \phi)$  independent of  $\lambda$  or parameters
- ⇒ linear models
- scale linearly
  - matrix inversion technique (P. Lewis, unpublished)

## KERNELS:

- Ross - RT "thick": large LAI approx. (Roujean et al. 1992)
- Ross - RT "thin": thin LAI approx. (Li 1993)
- Roujean - GO "bricks": randomly placed bricks, NO mutual shadowing (Roujean et al. '92)
- Li - GO "dense": based on Li-Strahler GO model WITH mutual shadowing, driven by illuminated visible crowns (Li 1993)
- Li - GO "sparse": based on Li-Strahler GO-MS model, driven by shadows on ground (Li 1993)