remote sensing quicknotes

2016-10-18 reran with updated biomass/nutrition data (after fixing shrub biomass estimation to more accurately handle VACC SP, SYMALB, and alders (at TWS)). Relationship actually got worse, I assume because biomass and gdm numbers were less insane after the fix so there was less variation to explain with remote data.

-NSERP\_AllPlots.csv is slightly outdated (couple hard-to-catch typos in veg plots

that were still inside study area but in slightly wrong locn)

-NSERP\_VegPlots is right (but doesn't include pellet plots)

-Need Brady to rerun after you're sure you've actually caught all issues

not sure if these are technically outliers, but...

-401.2014-07-18.40 ARTTRI 106.9 basal diam - puts biomass an order of magnitude > other plots

-376.2014-07-17.0 ARTTRI 79.78 basal diam - not order of mag >, but still pretty big and doesn't fit general trend of data

-so, note to self i guess... sagebrush doesn't track well with NDVI/EVI (duh, it's not very green)

plots in biomass that aren't in gdm

(prob because don't have forage plants, but should double-check

bc id think those would be 0s)

> setdiff(biomass.lifeform$PlotVisit, gdm.plot$PlotVisit)

* "1026.2015-07-29" -
* "1028.2015-07-29"
* "1046.2015-08-04"
* "1057.2015-07-27"
* "1059.2015-07-27"
* "1242.2015-08-05"
* "192.2015-08-04"
* "194.2015-08-03"
* "210.2014-08-26"
* "221.2015-08-28"
* "222.2015-08-28"
* "224.2015-08-28"
* "237.2014-08-29"
* "290.2014-08-14"
* "292.2014-08-14"
* "426.2014-08-27"
* "511.2014-08-26"
* "512.2014-08-26"
* "540.2015-08-21"
* "593.2014-08-21"
* "606.2014-08-18"
* "608.2014-08-18"
* "866.2014-08-07"
* "878.2014-08-05"
* "931.2014-07-16"

Discovered and fixed error in code that was dropping some forgae shrubs if the lab had id’d them as “stem” or “leaf”