

# EXTRACTING GRASS CONTRIBUTION OF NDVI

FOR DAN RUBENSTEIN ET AL.

MAX GOTTS<sup>1,2,3</sup> ✉

<sup>1</sup> Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA

<sup>2</sup> Upwell Turtles, Monterey, California 93940, USA

<sup>3</sup> Lost Years Institute, Mill Valley, California 94941, USA

✉ mgotts@princeton.edu

---

We intend to extract grass-contribution to NDVI from LANDSAT data since the level of greenery of an area's grasses is a key aspect of the life-dinner model for habitat use.

Random forest models were used on raw LANDSAT band data to classify the North Mpala Research Area into three distinct categories, each characterized by % tree cover: open bush (OB,  $\sim 10\%$ ), light bush (LB,  $\sim 50\%$ ), and medium bush (MB,  $\sim 90\%$ ). We also have NDVI from the same LANDSAT data, so we have enough information to estimate the grass contribution for each pixel of NDVI.

Consider that the NDVI of a pixel can be given by the expression:

$$\text{NDVI}(\text{pixel}) = \sum_{z \in \text{pixel}} \frac{\text{ndvi}(z)}{\text{area}(\text{pixel})}$$

Where the function  $\text{NDVI}(\cdot)$  is the average NDVI of a pixel, whereas the function  $\text{ndvi}(\cdot)$  has virtually infinite resolution. Let's say that the resolution of this function is a "plot," like a pixel, but as small as we want. We will use this hypothetical function as a guide so we can semi-formally construct a model of NDVI-contributions. Our first assumption is that tree NDVI is more constant than grass NDVI. In fact, we assume tree NDVI will be constant through an area during a certain time period (i.e. during the 16-day period in which the NDVI pictures in question were taken).

Then let's say that  $\text{gndvi}(\cdot)$  is the NDVI of grass, equivalent in all ways to the function  $\text{ndvi}(\cdot)$ , but we want to separate it out. This is the function we are solving for.

$$\text{ndvi}(z) = \begin{cases} T \times \text{area}(\text{plot}) & \text{if } z \text{ contains only trees} \\ \text{gndvi}(z) & \text{if } z \text{ contains only grass} \end{cases}$$

Now notice that

$$\text{area}(\text{pixel}) = (\# \text{ of plots}) (\text{area}(\text{plot}))$$

We now plug all of this into the original formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{NDVI}(\text{pixel}) &= \frac{(\# \text{ trees plots})T\text{area}(\text{plot}) + \sum_{z \in \text{pixel}, z \text{ contains only grass}} \text{gndvi}(z)}{(\# \text{ of plots}) (\text{area}(\text{plot}))} \\ &= (\% \text{ tree cover}(\text{pixel}))T + \text{mean grass NDVI contribution}(\text{pixel}) \end{aligned}$$

Which means we can say,

$$\text{mean grass NDVI} = \frac{\text{NDVI}(\text{pixel}) - (\% \text{ tree cover})T}{1 - \% \text{ tree cover}}$$

By simply scaling up our previous value to imagine what would happen if grass covered the entire pixel.

To do this practically, we need to know the value of  $T$  and know the percent tree cover. We will perform a regression to obtain  $T$ , and we will use our habitat data for percent tree cover, making general estimates for each value.

We know that  $T$  will approximate

$$T \approx 1/90\% \times (\text{mean MB NDVI})$$

We get  $T \approx 7.238281 \times 10^{-5}$ .