

Agricultural Classification of Multi-Temporal MODIS Imagery in Northwest Argentina Using Kansas Crop Phenologies

September 17, 2014

background.pdf

Jarrett Keifer
Department of Geography

./logo.eps

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Can I...

- ▶ develop a phenological classification toolset?
- ▶ extract crop signatures from Kansas data?
- ▶ classify an Argentina study area with the Kansas signatures?

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Can I...

- ▶ develop a phenological classification toolset?
- ▶ extract crop signatures from Kansas data?
- ▶ classify an Argentina study area with the Kansas signatures?

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Can I...

- ▶ develop a phenological classification toolset?
- ▶ extract crop signatures from Kansas data?
- ▶ classify an Argentina study area with the Kansas signatures?

OUTLINE

1. Background
2. Study Areas
3. Data and Methods
4. Results and Discussion
5. Conclusion

BACKGROUND

DEFORESTATION IN ARGENTINA

DEFORESTATION IN ARGENTINA

- ▶ 1998 to 2002: 940,000 ha deforested
- ▶ *Ley de Bosques* passed in November 2007
 - ▶ Classified red, yellow, and green areas through the *Ordenamiento Territorial de los Bosques Nativos* (Land Management Order for Native Forests, OTBN) passed in 2009

DEFORESTATION IN ARGENTINA

- ▶ 1998 to 2002: 940,000 ha deforested
- ▶ *Ley de Bosques* passed in November 2007
 - ▶ Classified red, yellow, and green areas through the *Ordenamiento Territorial de los Bosques Nativos* (Land Management Order for Native Forests, OTBN) passed in 2009

DEFORESTATION IN ARGENTINA

- ▶ 1998 to 2002: 940,000 ha deforested
- ▶ *Ley de Bosques* passed in November 2007
 - ▶ Classified red, yellow, and green areas through the *Ordenamiento Territorial de los Bosques Nativos* (Land Management Order for Native Forests, OTBN) passed in 2009

DEFORESTATION IN ARGENTINA

Deforestation in Argentina, 2006 to 2011

Time Period	Hectares Deforested
2006 to <i>Ley de Bosques</i> (2007)	573,296
<i>Ley de Bosques</i> to OTBN (2009)	473,001
OTBN to 2011	459,108
Total	1,505,405

DEFORESTATION IN ARGENTINA

Deforestation in Argentina, 2006 to 2011

Time Period	Hectares Deforested
2006 to <i>Ley de Bosques</i> (2007)	573,296
<i>Ley de Bosques</i> to OTBN (2009)	473,001
OTBN to 2011	459,108
Total	1,505,405

- ▶ Deforestation has remained extremely high
- ▶ Questions the effectiveness of the *Ley de Bosques*

SOY AND ITS EFFECTS

- ▶ Argentina's soybean cultivation has continually increased
 - ▶ 5 million ha in 1993 to 19 million ha in 2011

SOY AND ITS EFFECTS

- ▶ Soy production highly mechanized
- ▶ Over 99 percent of Argentine soy is genetically modified
 - ▶ Resistance to glyphosate = heavy pesticide use
- ▶ Capital requirements cut out small producers

SOY AND ITS EFFECTS

- ▶ Soy production highly mechanized
- ▶ Over 99 percent of Argentine soy is genetically modified
 - ▶ Resistance to glyphosate = heavy pesticide use
- ▶ Capital requirements cut out small producers

SOY AND ITS EFFECTS

- ▶ Soy production highly mechanized
- ▶ Over 99 percent of Argentine soy is genetically modified
 - ▶ Resistance to glyphosate = heavy pesticide use
- ▶ Capital requirements cut out small producers

SOY AND ITS EFFECTS

- ▶ Soy production highly mechanized
- ▶ Over 99 percent of Argentine soy is genetically modified
 - ▶ Resistance to glyphosate = heavy pesticide use
- ▶ **Capital requirements cut out small producers**

SOY AND ITS EFFECTS

- ▶ Prevailing perception that soy drives deforestation
- ▶ Deforestation research has neglected to analyze specific crop cover

SOY AND ITS EFFECTS

- ▶ Prevailing perception that soy drives deforestation
- ▶ Deforestation research has neglected to analyze specific crop cover

GOAL 1

Goal

Develop a crop mapping toolset which is efficient and economical

GOAL 1

Goal

Develop a crop mapping toolset which is efficient and economical

Why is this important?

- ▶ Better understanding of the dynamics of deforestation
- ▶ More effective land management policies

GOAL 1

Goal

Develop a crop mapping toolset which is efficient and economical

Why is this important?

- ▶ Better understanding of the dynamics of deforestation
- ▶ More effective land management policies

GOAL 1

Goal

Develop a crop mapping toolset which is efficient and economical

Why is this important?

- ▶ Better understanding of the dynamics of deforestation
- ▶ More effective land management policies

VEGETATION INDICIES

Problem

Must be able to classify crops by type

VEGETATION INDICIES

Problem

Must be able to classify crops by type

- ▶ A Vegetation Index (VI) can help with crop identification
 - ▶ Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI)

VEGETATION INDICIES

Problem

Must be able to classify crops by type

- ▶ A Vegetation Index (VI) can help with crop identification
 - ▶ Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI)

VEGETATION INDICIES

NDVI

$$NDVI = \frac{\rho_{NIR} - \rho_{red}}{\rho_{NIR} + \rho_{red}}$$

VEGETATION INDICIES

NDVI

$$NDVI = \frac{\rho_{NIR} - \rho_{red}}{\rho_{NIR} + \rho_{red}}$$

- ▶ is a ratioing index
- ▶ minimizes multiplicative noise
- ▶ has issues with non-linearity and additive noise

VEGETATION INDICIES

NDVI

$$NDVI = \frac{\rho_{NIR} - \rho_{red}}{\rho_{NIR} + \rho_{red}}$$

- ▶ is a ratioing index
- ▶ minimizes multiplicative noise
- ▶ has issues with non-linearity and additive noise

VEGETATION INDICIES

NDVI

$$NDVI = \frac{\rho_{NIR} - \rho_{red}}{\rho_{NIR} + \rho_{red}}$$

- ▶ is a ratioing index
- ▶ minimizes multiplicative noise
- ▶ has issues with non-linearity and additive noise

VEGETATION INDICIES

Problem

Must be able to classify crops by type

VEGETATION INDICIES

Problem

Must be able to classify crops by type

Questions

- ▶ What if two crops have similar VI values on a single date?
- ▶ How does one determine a crop's VI values?

VEGETATION INDICIES

Question

What if two crops have similar VI values on a single date?

VEGETATION INDICIES

Question

What if two crops have similar VI values on a single date?

Answer

Use imagery from multiple dates.

TIME SERIES IMAGES

NASA's Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) Sensor

- ▶ Terra and Aqua satellites
- ▶ Each images the Earth once per day
- ▶ Composite 16-day NDVI imagery at 250-meter resolution

TIME SERIES IMAGES

NASA's Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) Sensor

- ▶ Terra and Aqua satellites
- ▶ Each images the Earth once per day
- ▶ Composite 16-day NDVI imagery at 250-meter resolution

TIME SERIES IMAGES

NASA's Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) Sensor

- ▶ Terra and Aqua satellites
- ▶ Each images the Earth once per day
- ▶ Composite 16-day NDVI imagery at 250-meter resolution

TIME SERIES IMAGES

Time Series Image (TSI)

- ▶ Each band is a 16-day VI composite
- ▶ Bands are sequential composites
- ▶ Contains enough bands to cover an entire growing season

TIME SERIES IMAGES

Time Series Image (TSI)

- ▶ Each band is a 16-day VI composite
- ▶ Bands are sequential composites
- ▶ Contains enough bands to cover an entire growing season

TIME SERIES IMAGES

Time Series Image (TSI)

- ▶ Each band is a 16-day VI composite
- ▶ Bands are sequential composites
- ▶ Contains enough bands to cover an entire growing season

TIME SERIES IMAGES

Key Points

- ▶ A TSI pixel shows VI values over time
- ▶ Each crop's phenology exhibits a unique temporal signature

CROP TEMPORAL SIGNATURES

Graphics/wardlowCropSignatures.png

(From Wardlow and Egbert 2005)

PHENOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION

Question

How does one determine a crop's VI values?

PHENOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION

Question

How does one determine a crop's VI values?

Answer

Existing approaches require training sites.

PHENOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION

Problem

What if you don't have training sites?

TIME SERIES IMAGES

Key Points

- ▶ A TSI pixel shows VI values over time
- ▶ Each crop's phenology exhibits a unique temporal signature

TIME SERIES IMAGES

Key Points

- ▶ A TSI pixel shows VI values over time
- ▶ Each crop's phenology exhibits a unique temporal signature

Sounds a lot like hyperspectral remote sensing...

TIME SERIES IMAGES

Idea

Could we use a hyperspectral-like method to fit known crop signatures to unknown pixels?

TIME SERIES IMAGES

Graphics/transformations.pdf

Two-Step Filter (TSF) method from Sakamoto et al. (2010)

- ▶ Two steps: (1) wavelet smoothing and (2) curve fitting
- ▶ Curve fitting can fit reference signature to unknown pixels

TSF Equation 1

$$RMSE = \left[\frac{1}{365/s} \sum_{x=j(0), j(1) \dots}^n (f(x) - g(x))^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

where

- ▶ n is the number of dates in the TSI
- ▶ $f(x)$ is the temporal signature for a given pixel in a dataset
- ▶ x is the DOY, as defined by $j(y)$

TSF Equation 2

$$g(x) = yscale \times h(xscale \times (x + tshift))$$

where

- ▶ *yscale* and *xscale* are coefficients controlling the vertical and horizontal scaling of a reference signature $h(x)$
- ▶ *tshift* is a constant representing the horizontal shift, in days, of $h(x)$
- ▶ x is the DOY

TSF METHOD

Graphics/transformations.pdf

TSF Equation 1

$$RMSE = \left[\frac{1}{365/s} \sum_{x=j(0), j(1) \dots}^n (f(x) - g(x))^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

Minimizing Equation 1 with appropriate constraints on *yscale*, *xscale*, and *tshift* will find the fit of a reference signature to a pixel.

PHENOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION

Problem

What if you don't have training sites?

PHENOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION

Problem

What if you don't have training sites?

Answer

The TSF equations allow the classification of unknown pixels using a library of crop signatures.

STUDY AREAS

KANSAS STUDY AREA

- ▶ 2012 Kansas top crops:
 - ▶ Winter wheat
 - ▶ Corn
 - ▶ Soy
- ▶ Ground truth:
USDA Cropland Data
Layer

Graphics/KSstudysite.pdf

KANSAS STUDY AREA

Kansas Study Site Planting Dates (adapted from Shroyer et al. 1996)

Crop	Planting Date Range
Wheat	25 September to 20 October
Corn	1 April to 10 May
Sorghum	15 May to 20 June
Soybeans	5 May to 10 June

Graphics/argentinaOverview_landscape.pdf

Graphics/pellegrini75to14_landscape.pdf

DEPARTMENT OF PELLEGRINI

Deforestation in Pellegrini, 2001 to 2011

Time Period	Hectares Cleared	Percent of Land Area	Hectares per Year
2001 to 2005	5,968	0.9	1,492
2006 to 2011	75,249	10.9	15,050

Deforestation in Pellegrini, 2001 to 2011

Time Period	Hectares Cleared	Percent of Land Area	Hectares per Year
2001 to 2005	5,968	0.9	1,492
2006 to 2011	75,249	10.9	15,050

Annual rate of clearing increased over 1000%!

Top crops in Pellegrini, 2001 to 2005

- ▶ Soy
- ▶ Corn
- ▶ Winter Wheat

(From Volante et al. 2005)

DATA AND METHODS

DATASETS

- ▶ 250-meter MODIS 16-day composite VI imagery
- ▶ 30-meter 2012 USDA Cropland Data Layer
- ▶ 30-meter Landsat 8 OLI satellite imagery
- ▶ Pellegrini boundary shapefile

DATASETS

- ▶ 250-meter MODIS 16-day composite VI imagery
- ▶ 30-meter 2012 USDA Cropland Data Layer
- ▶ 30-meter Landsat 8 OLI satellite imagery
- ▶ Pellegrini boundary shapefile

DATASETS

- ▶ 250-meter MODIS 16-day composite VI imagery
- ▶ 30-meter 2012 USDA Cropland Data Layer
- ▶ 30-meter Landsat 8 OLI satellite imagery
- ▶ Pellegrini boundary shapefile

DATASETS

- ▶ 250-meter MODIS 16-day composite VI imagery
- ▶ 30-meter 2012 USDA Cropland Data Layer
- ▶ 30-meter Landsat 8 OLI satellite imagery
- ▶ Pellegrini boundary shapefile

DATASETS

- ▶ 2014 Pellegrini Land Cover vector dataset

PELLEGRINI DATA COLLECTION

- ▶ Data collection in Pellegrini 12 March to 3 April
 - ▶ 400 random sample points
 - ▶ Direct observation
 - ▶ Interviews with farmers
 - ▶ Satellite image interpretation
 - ▶ Agricultural practices and planting/harvesting dates

PELLEGRINI DATA COLLECTION

- ▶ Data collection in Pellegrini 12 March to 3 April
 - ▶ 400 random sample points
 - ▶ Direct observation
 - ▶ Interviews with farmers
 - ▶ Satellite image interpretation
 - ▶ Agricultural practices and planting/harvesting dates

PELLEGRINI DATA COLLECTION

- ▶ Data collection in Pellegrini 12 March to 3 April
 - ▶ 400 random sample points
 - ▶ Direct observation
 - ▶ Interviews with farmers
 - ▶ Satellite image interpretation
 - ▶ Agricultural practices and planting/harvesting dates

PELLEGRINI DATA COLLECTION

- ▶ Data collection in Pellegrini 12 March to 3 April
 - ▶ 400 random sample points
 - ▶ Direct observation
 - ▶ Interviews with farmers
 - ▶ Satellite image interpretation
 - ▶ Agricultural practices and planting/harvesting dates

PROCESSING WORKFLOW

1. Reproject the MODIS composite VIs
2. Assemble composite VIs into TSIs
3. Extract crop signatures from the Kansas TSI
 - 3.1 Identify pure pixels (e.g. non-mixels)
 - 3.2 Use the CDL to isolate each crop
 - 3.3 Identify phenological groups using k-means clustering
 - 3.4 Extract pixel values for each group and average
4. Fit the Kansas signatures to the Kansas TSI using the TSF method
5. Classify the Kansas RMSE rasters and assess accuracy
6. Fit the Kansas signatures to the Argentina TSI
7. Classify the Argentina RMSE rasters and assess accuracy

REPROJECTION

1. Reproject the MODIS composite VIs
 - ▶ Land Processes Distributed Active Archive Center's (LPDAAC) MODIS Reprojection Tool

BUILDING THE TSIs

2. Assemble composite VIs into TSIs

- ▶ Python command line tool (PCLT) to stack composites
- ▶ Kansas TSI covered 2012 DOY 97 to 2012 DOY 273
- ▶ Argentina TSI covered 2014 DOY -13 to 2014 DOY 161
 - ▶ Aqua DOY 105 composite used in place of DOY 113 composite
 - ▶ DOY 129 interpolated from DOY 105 and DOY 145 composites

BUILDING THE TSIs

2. Assemble composite VIs into TSIs

- ▶ Python command line tool (PCLT) to stack composites
- ▶ Kansas TSI covered 2012 DOY 97 to 2012 DOY 273
- ▶ Argentina TSI covered 2014 DOY -13 to 2014 DOY 161
 - ▶ Aqua DOY 105 composite used in place of DOY 113 composite
 - ▶ DOY 129 interpolated from DOY 105 and DOY 145 composites

BUILDING THE TSIs

2. Assemble composite VIs into TSIs

- ▶ Python command line tool (PCLT) to stack composites
- ▶ Kansas TSI covered 2012 DOY 97 to 2012 DOY 273
- ▶ Argentina TSI covered 2014 DOY -13 to 2014 DOY 161
 - ▶ Aqua DOY 105 composite used in place of DOY 113 composite
 - ▶ DOY 129 interpolated from DOY 105 and DOY 145 composites

BUILDING THE TSIs

2. Assemble composite VIs into TSIs

- ▶ Python command line tool (PCLT) to stack composites
- ▶ Kansas TSI covered 2012 DOY 97 to 2012 DOY 273
- ▶ Argentina TSI covered 2014 DOY -13 to 2014 DOY 161
 - ▶ Aqua DOY 105 composite used in place of DOY 113 composite
 - ▶ DOY 129 interpolated from DOY 105 and DOY 145 composites

EXTRACT CROP SIGNATURES

3.1 Identify pure pixels (e.g. non-mixels)

- ▶ Intersected MODIS pixel grid with vectorized CDL
- ▶ Selected all features $\geq 53,000 \text{ m}^2$ in area

EXTRACT CROP SIGNATURES

3.1 Identify pure pixels (e.g. non-mixels)

- ▶ Intersected MODIS pixel grid with vectorized CDL
- ▶ Selected all features $\geq 53,000 \text{ m}^2$ in area

EXTRACT CROP SIGNATURES

3.2 Use the CDL to isolate each crop

- ▶ Resampled CDL to MODIS grid by majority
- ▶ Isolated the TSI pixels for each crop
 - ▶ Corn
 - ▶ Soy
 - ▶ Sorghum

EXTRACT CROP SIGNATURES

3.2 Use the CDL to isolate each crop

- ▶ Resampled CDL to MODIS grid by majority
- ▶ Isolated the TSI pixels for each crop
 - ▶ Corn
 - ▶ Soy
 - ▶ Sorghum

EXTRACT CROP SIGNATURES

3.2 Use the CDL to isolate each crop

- ▶ Resampled CDL to MODIS grid by majority
- ▶ Isolated the TSI pixels for each crop
 - ▶ Corn
 - ▶ Soy
 - ▶ Sorghum

3.3 Identify phenological groups using k-means clustering

- ▶ ENVI k-means tool
- ▶ Three clusters, 1.0% change threshold, 100 iterations

3.3 Identify phenological groups using k-means clustering

- ▶ ENVI k-means tool
- ▶ Three clusters, 1.0% change threshold, 100 iterations

EXTRACT CROP SIGNATURES

3.3 Extract pixel values for each group and average

- ▶ Pixels from each k-means cluster converted to points
- ▶ PCLT to find mean values from points

EXTRACT CROP SIGNATURES

3.3 Extract pixel values for each group and average

- ▶ Pixels from each k-means cluster converted to points
- ▶ PCLT to find mean values from points

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

CONCLUSION