

**Utilising airborne scanning laser (LiDAR) to
improve the assessment of Australian native
forest structure**

Alex C. Lee

BSc, MSc (Auckland)

**Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
at the Australian National University**

October 2008





River Red Gum (*E. camaldulensis*) located on an island in the Murray river, NE Victoria.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures.....	<i>x</i>
List of Tables.....	<i>xvi</i>
List of Equations.....	<i>xviii</i>
List of Abbreviations.....	<i>xix</i>
Certificate of Authorship.....	<i>xxi</i>
Preface.....	<i>xxii</i>
Acknowledgements.....	<i>xxiii</i>
Abstract.....	<i>xxiv</i>
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.1.1 The requirement for forest information.....	1
1.1.2 Forest assessment in Australia	4
<i>State of the Forest Reporting</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Continental Forest Monitoring</i>	<i>7</i>
1.1.3 Dealing with scale in remote sensing of forests	10
1.1.4 Summary	13
1.2 Thesis Research Question	15
1.2.1 Primary research question	15
<i>Rationale and Research Objectives.....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Objective 1: Measuring forest cover using LiDAR.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Objective 2: Measuring forest height using LiDAR.....</i>	<i>17</i>
1.2.2 Research delimitations	18
1.3 Outline of Thesis.....	20
Chapter 2. Research issues	21
2.1 Introduction	21

2.2	Continental Forest Measurement in Australia	22
2.2.1	Description of Australian forests.....	22
2.2.2	Defining and measuring Australia’s forests	24
	<i>National Vegetation Information System</i>	25
	<i>Current National Forest Inventory reporting</i>	26
	<i>Limitations with NFI forest height and cover reporting</i>	30
2.2.3	Utilising data within integrated sampling schemes	33
	<i>Sampling strategies overview</i>	33
	<i>Random, systematic, and stratified random sampling</i>	36
	<i>Model based sampling</i>	37
	<i>Using field data for remote sensing calibration</i>	38
2.3	Remote Sensing of Forests.....	40
2.3.1	Overview	40
2.3.2	LiDAR remote sensing of forests	46
	<i>Overview</i>	46
	<i>Large footprint LiDAR</i>	50
	<i>LiDAR for Australian forests</i>	51
	<i>LiDAR calibration studies</i>	52
2.3.3	Tree crown delineation using high resolution remote sensing	54
	<i>Local minima location</i>	55
	<i>Minima contouring</i>	56
	<i>Template matching and object-oriented analyses</i>	57
	<i>Delineation limitations</i>	58
2.4	Scale in Remote Sensing	60
2.4.1	Overview	60
	<i>Modifiable Areal Unit Problem</i>	62
	<i>Hierarchy theory and Landscape Ecology</i>	63

2.5	Summary	65
Chapter 3.	Data Analysis Methodology	67
3.1	Introduction	67
3.2	Research Design Overview	69
3.2.1	Multi-scale strategy overview	69
	<i>Developing a hierarchical multi-scale modelling framework.....</i>	<i>69</i>
	<i>Applying the multi-scale hierarchical framework.....</i>	<i>71</i>
3.3	Data Collection	75
3.3.1	Introduction	75
3.3.2	Queensland study site.....	75
	<i>Overview of Queensland multi-stage sampling.....</i>	<i>78</i>
	Stage III: LiDAR data capture	79
	Stage IV: Field sampling.....	81
	Stage V: Georeferencing of photography to LiDAR	83
3.3.3	NE Victorian study site	85
	<i>Plot location site descriptions</i>	<i>88</i>
3.3.4	Data descriptions for both sites	91
	<i>Ancillary data.....</i>	<i>91</i>
	<i>Summary of Queensland and NE Victorian field data</i>	<i>91</i>
	<i>API classification comparisons with NFI.....</i>	<i>91</i>
3.4	Phase 1 – LiDAR Plot / Stand Scale Forest Structure Assessment.....	94
3.4.1	Introduction	94
3.4.2	LiDAR pre-processing	94
	<i>Stage VI: Bare ground surfaces</i>	<i>94</i>
	<i>Site Characteristics and terrain complications.....</i>	<i>96</i>
3.4.3	Estimating Tree Height for Plot / Stand	98
	<i>Stage VIII: Maximum and predominant height from LiDAR.....</i>	<i>98</i>

	<i>Plot scale LiDAR apparent vertical profiles</i>	99
	<i>Creating apparent vertical profiles using field data</i>	102
	<i>Growth stage assessment using apparent vertical profiles</i>	103
3.4.4	Estimating plot scale canopy cover	104
	<i>Stage VIII: Foliage and Crown cover</i>	104
3.5	Phase II –Tree and Component Scale Structure Modelling	106
3.5.1	Tree scale modelling strategy	106
	<i>HSCOI Stage IX: Calculation of stem diameter.....</i>	107
3.5.2	Individual crown segmentation and delineation.....	109
	<i>Conceptual overview.....</i>	109
	<i>Stage I - Empirical functions for general crown templates.....</i>	110
	<i>Stage II - Creating individual crown segments.....</i>	114
	<i>Stage III - Classification of crown segments.....</i>	116
	<i>Stage IV - Creating crown objects</i>	121
3.5.3	Tree component scale LiDAR modelling.....	127
	<i>Branch radius calculation.....</i>	130
3.6	Phase 3 – Multi-Scale Calibration and Validation Case Studies	131
3.6.1	Introduction	131
3.6.2	Multi-scale assessment of height and cover	131
	<i>Multi-scale predominant height assessment.....</i>	131
	<i>Multi-scale canopy cover assessment</i>	136
	<i>LiDAR and API crown cover comparison.....</i>	137
	<i>Crown Separation method test.....</i>	138
3.6.3	Landsat cover investigation and validation	139
3.6.4	ICESat calibration with airborne LiDAR.....	142
	<i>Vegetation comparisons.....</i>	143
	<i>ICESat footprint derivation and attribute extraction.....</i>	143

3.7	Summary	150
Chapter 4. Results		152
4.1	Introduction	152
4.2	Field Plot Representativeness	153
4.3	Multi-Scale Height Results	155
4.3.1	Plot scale height results	155
	<i>Maximum canopy height</i>	155
	<i>Predominant canopy height</i>	157
4.3.2	LiDAR height results with different assessment areas.....	159
	<i>Multi-scale variation of LiDAR height in NE Victoria</i>	159
	<i>Multi-scale variation of LiDAR height at Injune</i>	164
4.3.3	Apparent vertical profiles.....	166
	<i>Simulating apparent vertical profiles</i>	166
	<i>Growth stage and disturbance assessment using profiles</i>	168
4.4	Multi-scale Canopy Cover results	176
4.4.1	Plot scale cover results	176
	<i>Comparisons between cover using field data</i>	176
	<i>Crown cover comparison between LiDAR and photography</i>	180
	<i>LiDAR foliage-branch cover comparisons with field data</i>	182
	<i>SLATS foliage projective cover comparison with LiDAR cover</i>	184
	<i>Correlations between cover metrics and data sources</i>	186
	<i>Crown separation method test results</i>	189
4.4.2	Forest cover assessment at a range of scales	192
4.5	Tree Scale Stem and Crown Delineation Results	198
4.5.1	Tree stem density and location.....	198
	<i>Stem mapping at Injune</i>	198
	<i>Tree scale stem diameter derived from height</i>	200

4.5.2	Tree crown delineation results	201
4.6	Multi-Scale Calibration Results	209
4.6.1	Landsat pixel scale LiDAR cover calibration	209
4.6.2	Crown and foliage cover translation function	211
4.6.3	ICESAT case study calibration using LiDAR height and cover	215
4.6.4	Stand reconstruction results using tree components.....	218
4.7	Summary	225
Chapter 5.	Discussion	227
5.1	Introduction	227
5.2	Improving the Assessment of Forest Structure using LiDAR.....	228
5.2.1	Improving forest structure measurement using LiDAR.....	228
5.2.2	Improving forest height assessment using LiDAR.....	233
	<i>Maximum canopy height</i>	<i>233</i>
	<i>Predominant canopy height</i>	<i>234</i>
	<i>Apparent Vertical Profiles</i>	<i>236</i>
	<i>Maximum stand height at a range of assessment scales</i>	<i>239</i>
	<i>Predominant Height at a range of assessment scales</i>	<i>240</i>
	<i>National Forest Inventory Reporting</i>	<i>241</i>
5.2.3	Improving forest cover assessment using LiDAR.....	241
	<i>Field data comparisons.....</i>	<i>242</i>
	<i>LiDAR cover comparisons with field and CASI.....</i>	<i>243</i>
	<i>LiDAR to API comparisons</i>	<i>245</i>
	<i>LiDAR to Landsat TM comparisons.....</i>	<i>247</i>
	<i>Landscape sampling.....</i>	<i>248</i>
	<i>Multi-scale sampling and reporting of cover.....</i>	<i>249</i>
5.2.4	Assessment of the Height Scaled Crown Openness Index (HSCOI)	251
	<i>HSCOI derived stem density</i>	<i>251</i>

<i>HSCOI derived stem height and diameter</i>	253
<i>HSCOI crown delineation</i>	253
5.2.5 Calibration case study examples using LiDAR.....	256
<i>Landsat TM calibration using LiDAR structural output</i>	256
<i>Foliage-branch cover-to-crown cover translation function</i>	257
<i>ICESat calibration for continental monitoring</i>	258
<i>Stand reconstruction modelling for SAR simulation</i>	259
5.3 Practical Implications, Limitations and Recommendations	262
5.3.1 Practical implications	262
5.3.2 Limitations and recommendations for future research.....	264
Chapter 6. Conclusion	267
6.1 Thesis Conclusion	267
References	269
Appendix A	289
Ancillary Results.....	289
Appendix B	320
Plot data illustrations for NE Victoria.....	320
Appendix C	326
List of Published Papers.....	326
Statement of Author Contribution to Published Papers.....	327
Appendix D	332
Hemispherical photo calibration methodology overview	332

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: CFMF multi-tier design illustrating the potential role of airborne LiDAR as a Tier 2 dataset (after Wood, <i>et al.</i> , 2006).....	10
Figure 2: Distribution of NFI forest types in Australia. Source – State of the Forests Report, 2003 (NFI, 2003).	28
Figure 3: Illustration of different cover measurement sensors and range of scale and spatial resolution, both field and remotely sensed (McDonald, <i>et al</i> 1998; McCloy, 2006).....	29
Figure 4: Graphical representation of the elements of a small footprint airborne scanning laser (LiDAR) system. GPS refers to Global Positioning System, INS is Inertial Navigation System. Note that the graphic and elements are illustrative only and not to scale.....	49
Figure 5: Methods chapter layout showing major components of LiDAR assessment of forest structure.	68
Figure 6: Thesis conceptual overview outlining linkages between multi-scale hierarchal modelling and applications for modelling forests with LiDAR.	72
Figure 7: Flowchart of multi-scale calibration modelling and application strategy ..	74
Figure 8: Location of the 37 x 60 km Injune study area, within south-central Queensland.	76
Figure 9: Sketch of the Maranoa River by the explorer Thomas Mitchell in 1846 (upper) (Mitchell, 1846); and a photo of the Maranoa from a nearby location in 2004 (lower).	77
Figure 10: Landsat ETM image (2003) of study area and systematic photo and LiDAR plot layout, with field plot locations circled. State Forests are the light green hashed areas. Study area boundary was 37 km x 60 km, and sampling units are 4 km apart.....	80
Figure 11: True colour 1:4000 stereo aerial photograph of PSU 138 overlain with the 500 x 150 m primary sampling unit and 30 secondary sampling units (50 x 50 m). Polygon vectors mapped through API delineate different forest communities (based on dominant species composition and cover)....	84
Figure 12: Location of the secondary study site within the Broken and Ovens catchments in NE Victoria.....	85
Figure 13: Layout of LiDAR data collection with ancillary NVIS vegetation data aggregated to broad species classes (NLWRA, 2001) within the NE Victorian study area.....	87
Figure 14: Field plot site information summary (LiDAR derived) with max tree height (LiDAR), dominant species groups (field), and broad landform zone (derived) (Wood <i>et al.</i> , 2006).	88
Figure 15: Original DEM TIN created with all ground returns, for PSU 142	95
Figure 16: Final spatially refined DEM TIN for PSU 142	95
Figure 17: DEM difference surface - original DEM subtracted from final DEM for PSU 142.	95
Figure 18: LiDAR representations – raw points profile across Qld plot width (p81-11), vertical profile of summed returns per 1m height interval, and cumulative height percentage curve summary.	101
Figure 19: Steps to generate foliage branch cover, and CHM crown cover from LiDAR	105

Figure 20: (a) Height-to-D ₁₃₀ translation function using 80% of field measured stems and (b) validation using remaining 20% of field stems.....	108
Figure 21: Hollows function derived from field data measurements (outside field plots), and applied to LiDAR derived stems.	108
Figure 22: Flowchart of crown delineation methodology.....	111
Figure 23: Calibration using 80% of field data trees (Upper) and validation using 20% of field data trees (Lower) for estimating crown area from height, for (a) Eucalypt and Angophora trees, and (b) Callitris and Acacia trees (live trees 5cm+ D ₁₃₀).	113
Figure 24: Crown segmentation using surface generated from a 1m circular (a) and 5x5m rectangular (b) moving window.	115
Figure 25: Smoothing of segmentations (a) and segment clipping with HSCOI derived crown boundary delineation (b).....	115
Figure 26: Illustration of different apparent vertical profiles for the two main structural types.....	118
Figure 27: Examples of the two broad genus groups based mature tree structural crown forms.....	119
Figure 28: Crown structural classification into two broad genus categories at (a) segment _{1m} and (b) segment _{5m} scales. Green is <i>Callitris-Acacia</i> and light brown is <i>Eucalypt-Angophora</i>	119
Figure 29: Derivation of circular crown shape assumption, using all field live stems 5cm+ D ₁₃₀ (n = 2708) and comparing crown north-south length versus east-west length.	122
Figure 30: Final crown structural classification (a) and delineation after spatial assessment (b).....	123
Figure 31: Voxel groups associated with branch clusters within an individual <i>E. populnea</i> tree from PSU 142, with a planimetric view (upper) and 3D view (lower).....	129
Figure 32: Predominant stand height assessment using LiDAR 10m cells at different spatial extents at CFMF plot 212 (Ovens river).	132
Figure 33: Illustration of CFMF plot p212 with plot, transect and stand scales of assessment. The LiDAR point data slice was approx. 100m deep....	133
Figure 34: Multi-scale assessment of predominant height for NE Victorian sites, with example for plot 212 shown.	135
Figure 35: Example of predominant height assessment at a range of scales for Injune (PSU 142 shown, with 10m cells within 30 larger 0.25ha SSU's).....	135
Figure 36: Illustration of the multiple scales of FBC circular assessment for NE Victorian plots. LiDAR (2m+) for plot 212 has red/orange colour as highest returns (~ 40 m), with lowest non-ground dark blue. Background image was Landsat ETM.	137
Figure 37: Vector pixel layer example for PSU 142, derived from Landsat SLATS FPC grid (background). Values within cells indicate FPC.....	141
Figure 38: LiDAR return density (all returns) for PSU 142. Values within cells indicate LiDAR FBC.....	141
Figure 39: HSCOI derived stems for PSU 142. Values within cells indicate stem density per FPC pixel (stems per hectare).....	141
Figure 40: HSCOI derived crown delineations for PSU 142. Values within cells indicate LiDAR crown cover percent per pixel area.	141
Figure 41: ICESat transects (light blue) with the airborne LiDAR transects (yellow) and numbered overlap locations across CFMF pilot region in NE Victoria.	142

Figure 42: Examples of the ICESat footprint size and shape attributes derived using airborne LiDAR. a) single footprint with returns that are within the footprint (black) and over 2m in height (light blue); and b) two footprints from different dates showing different shapes due to different laser sensors used.	146
Figure 43: Layout of the Results chapter showing the major components of the strategy for using LiDAR to improve forest structure measurement.	153
Figure 44: Comparison of the LiDAR structural (height and cover) range of field plots and all SSU's	154
Figure 45: Comparison of maximum height between field and LiDAR at Injune for; (a) field plots; and (b) individual tree height for 100 manually selected, isolated overstorey trees	156
Figure 46: Comparisons field and LiDAR for NE Victorian plots for; a) max plot height for field plot and transect areas; and b) frequency distribution of maximum LiDAR height.	156
Figure 47: Frequency distribution of LiDAR maximum height at Injune for: (a) field plots; and (b) all 4500 SSUs.	157
Figure 48: Injune field plot predominant height (10m cells) for: (a) from field data and LiDAR at different sampling rates, and (b) frequency distribution of LiDAR heights.	158
Figure 49: NE Victoria field plot predominant height (10m cells) for: (a) from field data and LiDAR at different sampling rates, and (b) frequency distribution of LiDAR heights.	158
Figure 50: Frequency distributions for predominant height at Injune for 4500 SSUs derived from transfer function using 90 th percentile LiDAR height. .	159
Figure 51: Representativeness test for field plot (~0.09 ha) and transect area (~1 ha) versus swath overlap area (~25ha) for LiDAR (a) predominant height, and (b) maximum height, in NE Victoria.	160
Figure 52: LiDAR predominant height assessment at a range of spatial scales for NE Victorian sites where field plots are located.	162
Figure 53: Comparison of sampling strategies for estimating stand (~20ha) predominant height for field plots in NE Victoria using (a) single locations (field or LiDAR); and (b) multiple samples within stand.	163
Figure 54: LiDAR predominant height assessment at a range of spatial scales for 12 PSUs at Injune. Dominant species codes are given in Chapter 3.	165
Figure 55: Comparisons between apparent vertical profile from LiDAR and field cubic modelling for matches that are: (a) good (p142-02), and (b) not as good (p81-11).	167
Figure 56: Correlation of percentage of cubes at each 1m height interval, with LiDAR and field apparent vertical profiles for matches that are; (a) good (p142-02), and (b) not as good (p81-11).	167
Figure 57: Field data summary for SSU 124-19, illustrating tree growth stage and genus distribution by stem diameter (total Basal Area = 4.30m ²) and stocking ($n = 603$).	169
Figure 58: Apparent vertical profiles from LiDAR (black) and field (grey) cubic modelling for SSU 124-19.	169
Figure 59: Growth stage example using indicative LiDAR vertical profiles from NE Victoria. For the LiDAR profiles the x-axis is percentage of canopy returns, y-axis is height above ground (m).	171
Figure 60: LiDAR apparent vertical profile showing the potential difference in fire intensity between two high country plots on steep slopes. (a) plot 562, less intensity fire impact, with understorey and lower canopy still	

	present. (b) plot 558, intense fire impact, no understorey or lower canopy left and scorched crowns.	172
Figure 61:	Comparison of LiDAR apparent vertical profiles and plot photos for plots in NE Victorian <i>E. radiata</i> forests, illustrating a potential understorey fire recovery sequence, based on the last recorded fire within; (a) 1 year (p313), (b) 12 years ago (p550), and (c) 64 years ago (p463).....	173
Figure 62:	Assessment of stand structure using apparent vertical profiles at a range of scales, for the Injune study area	175
Figure 63:	Injune field data comparisons for transect FPC versus transect FBC (left), and transect FBC (2000) versus field hemi-photo FBC (2004) (right).	177
Figure 64:	Comparison of FBC field plot measurements: a) transects in 2000 and 2004; and b) transects and hemispherical photo in 2004.....	178
Figure 65:	Estimated hemispherical photo view extent, based on calibration results for p142-13. HSCOI crown delineations are shown for reference. The field plot boundaries and transects are approximately 50m long	178
Figure 66:	Comparison of field tree-map CC measurements: a) with transect FBC; and b) with hemispherical-photo FBC.	179
Figure 67:	NE Victorian plot tree-map CC correspondence with hemispherical photo FBC.....	179
Figure 68:	Injune API CC (mid-point of class) correspondence with the LiDAR CC sample within the API polygon.	181
Figure 69:	Comparison of individual API polygon CC (mid-point of class) and LiDAR CC (mean, min and max) based on 25m cells within the PSU. Individual polygon IDs have been removed for clarity.	181
Figure 70:	NE Victorian API CC (mid-point of class) correspondence with the LiDAR CC field plot and transect area sample within the API polygon.	182
Figure 71:	Comparisons of LiDAR FBC at 0.5 and 2 m height thresholds, with a) field transect FBC; and b) FBC derived from hemispherical-photographs.	183
Figure 72:	LiDAR FBC distribution from a) Injune field plots; and b) 4500 SSUs across study area.....	183
Figure 73:	SLATS Landsat derived FPC distribution for the Injune study area (220,000ha). NFI forest classes are shown.....	184
Figure 74:	SLATS Landsat derived FPC distribution for the NE Victoria study area. NFI forest classes are shown.	185
Figure 75:	Crown separation transect method for p142-13. Field mapped stems are solid orange circles (proportional to D_{130}) and open circles (proportional to mean crown radius). LiDAR point sampling density (grey) and HSCOI crown delineations (green) are shown. Field plot boundaries and transects are 50m long.	190
Figure 76:	Crown separation transect method for p81-16. Map elements are described in the Figure 75 caption. Field plot boundaries and transects are 50m long.	190
Figure 77:	Apparent vertical profiles for p142-13 (a) and p81-16 (b), highlight different vertical foliage characteristics, which may contribute to the different cover results observed.	191
Figure 78:	Comparison of FBC from LiDAR and hemispherical photos, in a) field plot area; and b) transect area.	194
Figure 79:	Comparison of FBC from LiDAR in transect area and field plot hemispherical-photo.	194

Figure 80: Comparison of FBC for different data and pixel sizes, within the LiDAR swath for NE Victorian plot 220.	194
Figure 81: LiDAR FBC at plot locations with increasing assessment area, for Floodplain ecozone.	195
Figure 82: LiDAR FBC at plot locations with increasing assessment area, for Foothills ecozone.	195
Figure 83: LiDAR FBC at plot locations with increasing assessment area, for Subalpine ecozone.	195
Figure 84: LiDAR FBC at plot locations with increasing assessment area, for the NE Victorian Montane ecozone.	196
Figure 85: LiDAR FBC at plot locations with increasing assessment area for Injune.	197
Figure 86: Crown/clusters and stem locations identified using the HSCOI surface generated for PSU 142. Darker areas in the HSCOI _{stand} surface indicate crowns that are taller and contain a greater density of canopy elements. Internal squares are SSU field plot locations numbered (from left to right) as 02, 13, 18 and 20.	199
Figure 87: Correspondence between field-measured D_{130} , and height derived D_{130} from HSCOI derived stems.	200
Figure 88: Correspondence between plot-level basal area, for stems measured in the field and estimated from LiDAR HSCOI modelling.	201
Figure 89: Correlation between field estimated crown area and area derived from LiDAR HSCOI crown delineations, aggregated into broad class types.	205
Figure 90: Comparison of crown diameter for; a) field and HSCOI trees from plots 142-13 and 81-16, and b) NE Victorian plot CC comparison between field tree-map buffer and HSCOI crowns.	207
Figure 91: NE Victorian LiDAR crown delineation examples and associated field plot centre photos. (a) Plot 382 with a good match between plot level crown cover and stem density; and (b) Plot 562 with a poor match for plot level crown cover and stem density.	208
Figure 92: Comparisons of SLATS FPC and LiDAR FBC at 0.5m (left) and 2m (right) thresholds.	210
Figure 93: Comparison of SLATS FPC and LiDAR CC.	210
Figure 94: Comparisons of LiDAR stem density and FBC at 0.5m (left) and 2m (right) thresholds.	210
Figure 95: Comparisons of LiDAR stem density and Landsat FPC (left), and LiDAR CC (right).	210
Figure 96: Comparison between LiDAR CC and SLATS FPC within 12 PSU's using all 25 m cells where $CC \geq FPC$ ($n = 855$).	212
Figure 97: Derivation of translation function between SLATS FPC and LiDAR CC within 12 PSU's, using 80% of 25 m cells where $CC \geq FPC$ ($n = 683$).	212
Figure 98: Validation of translation function between SLATS FPC and LiDAR CC within 12 PSU's, using 20 % of 25 m cells ($n = 172$) where $CC \geq FPC$	212
Figure 99: Comparison between LiDAR CC and FBC within 1161 x 25 m pixel sized areas from 12 PSU's.	214
Figure 100: Comparison between LiDAR CC and FBC for Injune SSU's (50 m), NE Victorian field plots (30 m), and selected ICESat footprints from NE Victoria (50 - 100m). Red arrows indicate current NFI CC-FPC translation thresholds.	214

Figure 101: Airborne LiDAR from three ICESat footprints from ALS tile 26 displayed on a 1 m LiDAR derived DEM.	216
Figure 102: Perspective view of LiDAR within ICESat footprint areas. See Figure 101 for legend.	216
Figure 103: Sample of mapped tree stems, crowns, and primary (thicker lines) and secondary (thinner lines) branch distributions in PSU 142 derived from the LiDAR data. Inset extent is marked as a dashed box.	219
Figure 104: Perspective view of a portion of PSU 142 showing mapped tree stems, crowns, and voxels derived from the LiDAR analyses. The view extent of Figure 103 is in the foreground.	219
Figure 105: (a) <i>E. populnea</i> -dominated forest at PSU_142. (b) Graphical output of part of the reconstructed canopy from the DSTO radar simulation (Lucas <i>et al.</i> , 2006c).	220
Figure 106: Injune correspondence between field data and LiDAR allometric and component estimated biomass – all assessed stems ($n = 200$)	221
Figure 107: Injune correspondence between field data and LiDAR allometric and component estimated biomass – LiDAR modelling outlier stems removed ($n = 185$)	222
Figure 108: Injune correspondence between field data and LiDAR allometric and component estimated biomass – LiDAR modelling and highly different field outlier stems removed ($n = 170$)	222
Figure 109: Injune correspondence between LiDAR allometric and LiDAR component estimated biomass – all assessed stems ($n = 200$)	223
Figure 110: Summary of predominant and max height for each CFMF field plot, by ecozone.	294
Figure 111: Comparison of stand sampling strategies for estimating stand (~20ha) predominant height by ecozone.	295
Figure 112: SLATS Landsat FPC (2000) spatial distribution at the Injune study site.	305
Figure 113: NE Victorian SLATS FPC (uncalibrated) from two Landsat scenes. Systematic field plots are yellow, additional calibration plots are pink.	306
Figure 114: Injune cover matrix graphs. All scales are percent cover.	311
Figure 115: NE Victoria cover matrix graphs. All scales are percent cover.	312
Figure 116: LiDAR derived tree stem basal area (per pixel) versus SLATS FPC, for 1114 Landsat pixels in 12 PSUs at Injune.	319
Figure 117: Registration of calibration images using Nikon fisheye lens, showing effective view area, zenith rings, and gaps in extent with the merged photos.	333
Figure 118: Calibration images taken at ANU showing area imaged, and the same effective view extent with (a) Nikon lens, and (b) Minolta lens.	334
Figure 119: Effect of background colour and pixel brightness threshold in hemispherical photo analysis on cover estimates, using Nikon and Minolta lenses.	335
Figure 120: Simulated viewsheds at different zenith angles for Nikon fisheye photos when taken along Qld transects within a field plot	336
Figure 121: Assessing potential hemispherical photo view areas for NE Victorian plots against of LiDAR returns (FBC) clipped at a range of circular areas.	338
Figure 122: Assessing view area of NE Victorian plot hemispherical photos against LiDAR (FBC) % circular area assessment for plot and transect areas respectively.	339

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Area of NFI forest types ('000 ha) across the States and Territories in Australia. Source: National Forest Inventory State of the Forests Report, 2003.	27
Table 2: NFI translation between foliage projective cover (FPC) and crown cover (CC) (National Forest Inventory, 1998).	31
Table 3: Advantages and disadvantages assumptions of different hierarchal processing levels for forest assessment using LiDAR.....	70
Table 4: Main stages in the acquisition, processing and analysis of field and remotely sensed data (Tickle, <i>et al.</i> , 2006).....	79
Table 5: Estimated year of last fire and logging for NE Victorian plots (DSE, 2003)	90
Table 6: NFI, Victorian SFRI , and Queensland API crown cover class standards...	92
Table 7: Height class and ranges for NFI, Victorian SFRI, and Queensland API standards	93
Table 8: Illustration of a selection of terrain complications on canopy height estimates	97
Table 9: Translation between LiDAR and field estimation methods for predominant height	99
Table 10: Growth Stage type using SFRI and EMC classifications	103
Table 11: Overview of processing stages for the HSCOI.....	107
Table 12: Genus probability selection criteria	120
Table 13: Spatial criteria for merging a segment with neighbouring segments.....	123
Table 14: Spatial criteria for splitting a segment	126
Table 15: Functions used to calculate branch start and end radius	130
Table 16: Multi-scale predominant height assessment buffer selection areas for NE Victorian plot locations.	134
Table 17: Formulae utilised for footprint dimension and area calculations:	143
Table 18: ICESat attributes extracted for comparison with airborne LiDAR.....	144
Table 19: Variables extracted or calculated for footprint size estimation.	144
Table 20: Assignment of LiDAR returns within ICESat footprint	145
Table 21: ICESat case study footprints; description, full waveform, and LiDAR apparent vertical profiles	147
Table 22: Description of LiDAR attributes utilised for ICESat calibration and validation	148
Table 23: Representativeness of Injune forest structure sampling, comparing LiDAR from 4500 SSUs across the landscape with LiDAR from field plots (in parentheses), by NFI class.	154
Table 24: Representativeness of NE Victorian forest structure sampling, comparing continental NFI data with field plot LiDAR (in parentheses).	154
Table 25: Maximum height comparison between field and LiDAR for Injune and NE Victoria plots	155
Table 26: Comparisons of predominant height: field and LiDAR for Injune and NE Victoria plots	159
Table 27: LiDAR height comparisons at a range of assessment area scales for NE Victoria	160
Table 28: Summary statistics for predominant height at a range of assessment scales, per NE Victorian ecozone	163

Table 29: Summary of matrix results for the field plot area.....	166
Table 30: Plot descriptions for three plots illustrating growth progression with time since fire.	172
Table 31: Comparison of relative accuracy of CC estimates between API and LiDAR CC, across different LiDAR sampling ranges of the API polygon. ...	180
Table 32: Comparison of NFI forest cover class distribution across the Injune landscape using SLATS FPC for study area, and LiDAR PSU sample (1,125ha) for FBC and CC.	184
Table 33: NE Victotian SLATS FPC for study area compared to LiDAR and hemi-photo data in field plot and transect areas, using percentage of 20km systematic samples in each NFI forest class.....	185
Table 34: Matrix of correlations for cover metrics across a range of datasets and measurement scales, for the Injune field plots *	187
Table 35: Matrix of correlations for cover metrics across a range of datasets and measurement scales, for the NE Victorian field plots	188
Table 36: Matrix of P-values for cover metric correlations across a range of datasets and measurement scales, for the NE Victorian field plots	188
Table 37: Crown separation test comparison for p142-13 and p81-16.....	189
Table 38: FBC comparison between field plot and transect area combinations for NE Victoria.	192
Table 39: Summary of LiDAR FBC at different scales, averaged per NE Victorian ecozone.	193
Table 40: Tree stem density per plot correspondence for Injune and NE Victoria from HSCOI modelling.....	199
Table 41: Description of LiDAR crown delineation validation classification types.	202
Table 42: Summary of crown delineation validation comparison of 90 trees aggregated by type.	202
Table 43: Examples of LiDAR crown delineation classification types found in the validation.	203
Table 44: Genus probably modelling accuracy assessment by delineation type, using 90 randomly selected trees	206
Table 45: SLATS FPC comparisons with LiDAR derived cover and stem density metrics for Injune	211
Table 46: LiDAR CC comparisons with SLATS FPC and LiDAR FBC, for Injune and NE Victoria.....	211
Table 47: LiDAR and ICESat attributes from the riparian strip footprint f (ICE-id = 484).....	217
Table 48: LiDAR and ICESat attributes from the mid-slope footprint (ICE-id = 480)	217
Table 49: LiDAR and ICESat attributes from the ridge top footprint (ICE-id = 475)	217
Table 50: Comparison of structural attributes between field data (4 plots) and LiDAR stand modelling for PSU 142	218
Table 51: Summary of biomass estimates for PSU 142 plots from field, LiDAR stem allometric, and LiDAR component sources.	223
Table 52: Summary of biomass functions using field data and LiDAR stem and components.....	224
Table 53: Major knowledge limitations for LiDAR utilisation in multi-scale sampling schemes.....	227
Table 54: Description of different types of LiDAR and field error with stand reconstruction using component modelling, for SAR simulation.	261
Table 55: Species name and API codes for Injune trees.....	289

Table 56: Injune field plot height results from field and LiDAR data for max and predominant height, and at different measurement scales.....	290
Table 57: NE Victorian field plot height results across a range of datasets and measurement scales. All values are in metres.	292
Table 58: Results from correlation and Kolmogorov-Smirnov test comparisons between LiDAR and field cubic modeling derived apparent vertical profiles for Injune.	296
Table 59: Injune field plots apparent vertical profiles using modelled field data (red) and LiDAR returns (blue), and plot centre hemispherical photo.	297
Table 60: Injune field plot percentage cover results across a range of datasets, cover metrics, and measurement scales.....	307
Table 61: NE Victorian field plot percentage cover results across a range of datasets, cover metrics, and measurement scales. All values in percentage cover.	309
Table 62: Crown Separation ratio calculation test for p142-13	313
Table 63: Crown Separation ratio calculation test for p81-16	314
Table 64: Slope and intercept significance values for calibration and validation functions	315
Table 65: LiDAR return density at different height thresholds for Injune plots.....	317
Table 66: LiDAR return density at different height thresholds for NE Victorian plots.	318
Table 67: NE Victorian field plot data (left to right) - LiDAR CHM surfaces, LiDAR apparent vertical profiles, and plot centre hemispherical photos. With CHM surfaces dark blue is ground, red-brown is tallest canopy. Refer to LiDAR profile for respective heights (m).	320

LIST OF EQUATIONS

Equation 1	104
Equation 2	107
Equation 3	112

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AIRSAR	Airborne Synthetic Aperture Radar
AGO	Australian Greenhouse Office
API	Aerial Photographic Interpretation
BA	Basal Area
CASI	Compact Airborne Spectral Imager
CC	Crown Cover
CFMF	Continental Forest Monitoring Framework
CHM	Canopy Height Model
CRCGA	Cooperative Research Centre for Greenhouse Accounting
D ₁₃₀	Diameter of tree stem at 130 cm height above ground
DEM	Digital Elevation Model
DNRE	Department of Natural Resources and Environment (Victoria)
DPI	Department of Primary Industries (Queensland)
DSTO	Defence Science and Technology Organisation
DTM	Digital Terrain Model
EMC	Ecological Maturity Classification
FBC	Foliage-Branch Cover
FPC	Foliage Projective Cover
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
GPS	Global Positioning System
HSCOI	Height Scaled Crown Openness Index
ICESat	Ice, Cloud, and land Elevation Satellite
IBRA	Interim Biogeographical Regionalisation for Australia
JERS	Japanese Earth Resources Satellite
LiDAR	Light Detection And Ranging
MAUP	Modifiable Areal Unit Problem

MODIS	MODerate-resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer
NFI	National Forest Inventory
NFPS	National Forest Policy Statement
NLWRA	National Land and Water Resources Audit
NVIS	National Vegetation Information System
PSU	Primary Sampling Unit
QDNRM	Queensland Department of Natural Resources and Mines
RSE	Residual Standard Error
RWG2	Research Working Group 2
δ	Standard Deviation
SAR	Synthetic Aperture Radar
SFRI	Statewide Forest Resource Inventory (Victoria)
SLATS	Statewide Landcover And Trees Study (Queensland)
SLR	Single Lens Reflex (camera)
SPOT	Satellite Pour l'Observation de la Terre
SOFR	State of the Forests Report
SSU	Secondary Sampling Unit
TIN	Triangulated Irregular Network
TM / ETM	Thematic Mapper / Enhanced Thematic Mapper
UTM	Universal Transverse Mercator

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP

I hereby declare that this submission is my own work and that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it contains no material previously published or written by another person nor material which to a substantial extent was accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma at the Australian National University or any other educational institution, except where due acknowledgement is made in the thesis. Any contribution made to the research by colleagues with whom I have worked at the Australian National University or elsewhere during my candidature is fully acknowledged.

Alex Lee

Date:

PREFACE

Parts of the description of the Injune study area in Chapter 3 of this thesis was published in:

Tickle, P. K., Lee, A., Lucas, R. M., Austin, J. and Witte, C. (2006) Quantifying Australian forest floristics and structure using small footprint LiDAR and large scale aerial photography. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 223, 379-394.

Description of the Height Scaled Crown Openness Index (HSCOI) in Chapter 3, 4, and 5 was published in:

Lee, A. C. and Lucas, R. M. (2007) A LiDAR-derived Canopy Density Model for Tree Stem and Crown Mapping in Australian Forests. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 111, 493-518.

Description and discussion of the LiDAR modelling for stand reconstruction for SAR simulation was published in:

Lucas, R. M., Lee, A. C. and Williams, M. L. (2006) Enhancing SAR simulations using LiDAR for understanding the relations between forest structure and SAR imagery. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 44, 2736-2754.

In Tickle *et al.*, (2006) and Lucas *et al.*, (2006) all LiDAR related processing and discussion was undertaken by me.

Appendix 3 provides a more detailed description of author contributions to the above papers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation for all the people who helped me in various ways as I undertook this research. In particular, I sincerely thank the members of my supervisory panel for their guidance and support – Dr Cris Brack, Dr Brian Lees, Dr Brendan Mackey, and especially Dr Richard Lucas for being such a willing and energetic colleague on field trips, conference, and late night online writing sessions from opposite sides of the globe. I also extend my thanks to:

- The Fenner School of Environment and Society for financial and academic support, and for making the almost home away from home bearable. In particular I thank the IT and other support staff for their continual help.
- The Cooperative Research Centre for Greenhouse Accounting for financially supporting the research, and providing a both academically stimulating and challenging forum to test my ideas out.
- The staff of the various government agencies that provided resources for field work, supplied data, and technical support. So, a big thank you to everyone at the Bureau of Rural Sciences, the Queensland Department of Natural Resources and Mines, and the Victorian Department of Natural Resources and Environment.
- My parents, Myrene and Ray Lee for always believing in me and supporting any crazy idea that I wanted to do. I also thank Sue and Justin McCarthy (and the rest of the McCarthy clan) for endless support to our long studying (or suffering?) family with child minding and the rest.
- Finally, to my lovely wife Tess whom I owe so much, for keeping me sane when there was so much more to do, and being able to look after our sons, and for not going too crazy while trying to complete her own PhD. Lastly, I thank my magic little man Max, who would always cheerfully waved goodbye to Daddy as he disappeared off to “nooni”. We can now finally spend more time together.

ABSTRACT

Enhanced understanding of forest stocks and dynamics can be gained through improved forest measurement, which is required to assist with sustainable forest management decisions, meet Australian and international reporting needs, and improve research efforts to better respond to a changing climate. Integrated sampling schemes that utilise a multi-scale approach, with a range of data sourced from both field and remote sensing, have been identified as a way to generate the required forest information. Given the multi-scale approach proposed by these schemes, it is important to understand how scale potentially affects the interpretation and reporting of forest from a range of data.

To provide improved forest assessment at a range of scales, this research has developed a strategy for facilitating tree and stand level retrieval of structural attributes within an integrated multi-scale analysis framework. The research investigated the use of fine-scale (~1m) airborne Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) data (1,125 ha in central Queensland, and 60,000 ha in NE Victoria) to calibrate other remotely sensed data at the two study sites. The strategy refines forest structure mapping through three-dimensional (3D) modelling combined with empirical relationships, allowing improved estimation of maximum and predominant height, as well as foliage and crown cover at multiple scales. Tree stems (including those in the sub-canopy) were located using a height scaled crown openness index (HSCOI), which integrated the 3D density of canopy elements within the vertical profile into a two-dimensional spatial layer. The HSCOI modelling also facilitated the reconstruction of the 3D distribution of foliage and branches (of varying size and orientation) within the forest volume.

Comparisons between forests at the Queensland and NE Victorian study sites indicated that accurate and consistent retrieval of cover and height metrics could be achieved at multiple scales, with the algorithms applicable for semi-automated use in other forests with similar structure. This information has facilitated interpretation and evaluation of Landsat imagery and ICESat satellite laser data for forest height and canopy cover retrieval. The development of a

forest cover translation matrix allows a range of data and metrics to be compared at the plot scale, and has initiated the development of continuous transfer functions between the metrics and datasets. These data have been used subsequently to support interpretation of SAR data, by providing valuable input to 2D and 3D radar simulation models. Scale effects have been identified as being significant enough to influence national forest class reporting in more heterogeneous forests, thus allowing the most appropriate use and integration of remote sensed data at a range of scales. An empirically based forest minimum mapping area of 1 ha for reporting is suggested. The research has concluded that LiDAR can provide calibration information just as detailed and possibly more accurately than field measurements for many required forest attributes. Therefore the use of LiDAR data offers a unique opportunity to bridge the gap between accurate field plot structural information and stand to landscape scale sampling, to provide enhanced forest assessment in Australia.