

1 **The use of sun elevation angle for stereogrammetric boreal forest height in** 2 **open canopies**

3

4 Paul M. Montesano^{a,b}, Christopher Neigh^b, Guoqing Sun^c, Laura Duncanson^{b,c}, Jamon Van Den Hoek^d, K.
5 Jon Ranson^b

6

7 Affiliations

8 a Science Systems and Applications, Inc., 10210 Greenbelt Road, Lanham, MD 20706, USA

9 b Code 618, Biospheric Sciences Laboratory, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt MD 20771

10 c Department of Geographical Sciences, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742

11 d Geography and Geospatial Science, College of Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Sciences, Oregon State
12 University, Corvallis, OR, 97331, USA

13

14 Keywords: WorldView; sun elevation angle; forest structure; biome boundary; ecotone; taiga; tundra;
15 stereogrammetry; photogrammetry; digital surface model

16

17 Abstract

18 Stereogrammetry applied to globally available high resolution spaceborne imagery (HRSI; < 5 m spatial
19 resolution) yields fine-scaled digital surface models (DSMs) of elevation. These DSMs may represent
20 elevations that range from the ground to the vegetation canopy surface, are produced from stereoscopic
21 image pairs (stereopairs) that have a variety of acquisition characteristics, and have been coupled with
22 lidar data of forest structure and ground surface elevation to examine forest height. This work explores
23 surface elevations from HRSI DSMs derived from two types of acquisitions in open canopy forests. We
24 (1) apply an automated mass-production stereogrammetry workflow to along-track HRSI stereopairs, (2)
25 identify multiple spatially coincident DSMs whose stereopairs were acquired under different solar

26 geometry, (3) vertically co-register these DSMs using coincident spaceborne lidar footprints (from
27 ICESat-GLAS) as reference, and (4) examine differences in surface elevations between the reference lidar
28 and the co-registered HRSI DSMs associated with two general types of acquisitions (DSM types) from
29 different sun elevation angles. We find that these DSM types, distinguished by sun elevation angle at the
30 time of stereopair acquisition, are associated with different surface elevations estimated from automated
31 stereogrammetry in open canopy forests. For DSM values with corresponding reference ground surface
32 elevation from spaceborne lidar footprints in open canopy northern Siberian *Larix* forests with slopes <
33 10°, our results show that HRSI DSMs acquired with sun elevation angles > 35° and < 25° (during snow-
34 free conditions) produced characteristic and consistently distinct distributions of elevation differences
35 from reference lidar. The former include DSMs of near-ground surfaces with root mean square errors <
36 0.68 m relative to lidar. The latter, particularly those with angles < 10°, show distributions with larger
37 differences from lidar that are associated with open canopy forests whose vegetation surface elevations
38 are captured. Terrain aspect did not have a strong effect on the distribution of vegetation surfaces. Using
39 the two DSM types together, the distribution of DSM-differenced heights in forests ($\mu = 6.0$ m, $\sigma = 1.4$ m)
40 was consistent with the distribution of plot-level mean tree heights ($\mu = 6.5$ m, $\sigma = 1.2$ m). We conclude
41 that the variation in sun elevation angle at time of stereopair acquisition can create illumination conditions
42 conducive for capturing elevations of surfaces either near the ground or associated with vegetation
43 canopy. Knowledge of HRSI acquisition solar geometry and snow cover can be used to understand and
44 combine stereogrammetric surface elevation estimates to co-register and difference overlapping DSMs,
45 providing a means to map forest height at fine scales, resolving the vertical structure of groups of trees
46 from spaceborne platforms in open canopy forests.

47 **1. Introduction**

48 **1.1. High resolution spaceborne imagery for forest structure patterns**

49 High resolution spaceborne imagery (HRSI) is the orbital, Earth observation component of the
50 broader class of very-high resolution (VHR) imagery, which includes airborne data. Currently, HRSI

51 includes primarily multispectral sensors (e.g., SPOT-6 & -7, KOMPSAT-3 & -3A, WorldView-1, -2, -3,
52 & -4) from both the commercial and government sectors. These data can be used to complement forest
53 inventories with detailed characterization of forests across broad extents (Wulder, Hall, & Coops, 2004).
54 Access to commercial HRSI (< 5 m spatial resolution) data (at no direct cost) has been a catalyst for
55 continuing to develop methods for quantifying forest attributes and ecosystem properties (Neigh, Masek,
56 & Nickeson, 2013a). Previous work with optical imagery has highlighted the value of image texture,
57 seasonal brightness differences among image features, and object-based analysis for understanding the
58 spatial patterns of forest structure at multiple scales (Berner et al., 2012; Chopping, 2011; Coburn &
59 Roberts, 2004; Kayitakire, Hamel, & Defourny, 2006; Lamonaca, Corona, & Barbati, 2008; Mallinis,
60 Koutsias, Tsakiri-Strati, & Karteris, 2008; Manninen, Korhonen, Voipio, Lahtinen, & Stenberg, 2009;
61 Ozdemir & Karnieli, 2011; Wolter, Townsend, & Sturtevant, 2009).

62 **1.2. HRSI stereogrammetric estimates of forest canopy surfaces**

63 One use of HRSI is the application of stereogrammetry to estimate surface elevations. Recently,
64 work with this HRSI application has involved detailed surface elevation mapping, characterizing canopy
65 surface elevations, and quantifying height and biomass density in a variety of forests (Baltsavias, Gruen,
66 Eisenbeiss, Zhang, & Waser, 2008; Lagomasino, Fatoyinbo, Lee, & Simard, 2015; Montesano, Sun,
67 Dubayah, & Ranson, 2014; Neigh et al., 2016; 2014; Persson, Wallerman, & Olsson, 2013; Poon, Fraser,
68 & Zhang, 2007; Shean et al., 2016; Vega & St-Onge, 2008). The pointing capabilities of HRSI platforms
69 (e.g., QuickBird, IKONOS, GeoEye-1, WorldView-1, -2, -3, & -4) provide along-track (i.e. near
70 simultaneous) stereoscopic image pairs (stereopairs), where two image acquisitions are captured of the
71 same location from different angles within the same orbit. Stereogrammetry applied to these acquisitions
72 produces fine-scaled (~ 1 m) estimates of the elevation of surface features with pre-registration vertical
73 accuracies of < 4.5 m (Aguilar, del Mar Saldana, & Aguilar, 2014; DigitalGlobe, 2014; Dolloff &
74 Settergren, 2010; Hobi & Ginzler, 2012). Often, HRSI-derived estimates of vertical forest structure are
75 made by linking the canopy surface elevations captured in the stereogrammetrically-derived digital

76 surface model of elevations (DSM) with coincident estimates of the ground surface elevation from
77 another data source. In remote forested regions, coincident estimates of ground surface elevation beneath
78 the forest canopy are often unavailable or spatially limited. In the open canopy forests along the boreal
79 (taiga) - tundra ecotone (TTE) this results in forest height uncertainties too broad for capturing the vertical
80 component of TTE form and preventing a clear depiction of the differences in the important spatial
81 patterns of structure (Montesano, Sun, Dubayah, & Ranson, 2016). However, in these open canopy
82 forests, there may be an opportunity to exploit the visible ground surface between gaps in tree cover to
83 capture near-coincident ground and canopy surfaces, and thus three-dimensional forest structure, with
84 HRSI. Stereogrammetric forest height estimation is based on this concept of capturing both ground and
85 canopy surfaces from stereogrammetry and examining their differences to explore three-dimensional
86 forest structure.

87 **1.3. HRSI acquisition characteristics**

88 A central feature of HRSI data is the variation in image acquisition characteristics. These
89 characteristics explain the position and orientation of both the imaging platform and the sun relative to the
90 surface targets in the field of view. This sun-sensor-target (SST) geometry describes the average relative
91 position of these components in space at the time of image acquisition. For each image, these include the
92 average off nadir viewing and elevation angles, and the average elevation and azimuth angles of the sun,
93 and surface feature topography. This geometry is influenced in part by the target's diurnal and seasonal
94 sunlight regime, which is a function of the earth's orientation relative to the sun, the target's latitude and
95 topographic position, and the sensor's orientation relative to the sun and the target. As this geometry
96 changes, so does image radiometry both from one image to the next, but also within a given image (
97 Aguilar, Saldaña, & Aguilar, 2013; Epiphanyo & Huete, 1995; Honkavaara et al., 2009; Kimes, 1983;
98 Korpela, Heikkinen, Honkavaara, Rohrbach, & Tokola, 2011; Ranson, Daughtry, & Biehl, 1985; Wang,
99 Sousa, Gong, & Biging, 2004; Widlowski, Pinty, & Gobron, 2001).

100 Due to the off-nadir pointing capabilities of HRSI sensors, SST geometry over the same location
101 can vary widely. This wide variation can affect image radiometry through differences in how features are
102 viewed and illuminated, and thus the appearance of vegetation structure between images (Asner &
103 Warner, 2003; Kane et al., 2008; Wulder, Ortleypp, & White, 2008). This is particularly apparent in
104 summer acquisitions at high latitudes, where the position of the sun throughout the diurnal cycle affects
105 image texture in open canopy forests. In these forests, both forest structure and ground are visible to the
106 sensor. However, the sun's orientation relative to forest structural components (crowns and stems) can be
107 different from that relative to the ground. These changes in orientation not only affect how shadows are
108 cast, but also alter the illumination of surface features such that the difference in brightness (the contrast)
109 between 2 features in one acquisition will not necessarily be maintained in a second acquisition with
110 different SST geometry. These differences can affect the ability to distinguish and measure surface
111 features, such as trees.

112 In addition to the SST geometry of a single acquisition, stereopairs can be described by additional
113 geometry that explains the orientation of each viewing position with the target. The angles that describe
114 this orientation are the convergence angle, the bisector elevation angle, and the asymmetry angle. The
115 convergence angle, related to the base-to-height ratio (the distance between sensors relative to the height
116 above the target surface), is formed between two observation rays along a plane with the target (the
117 epipolar plane). The bisector angle explains the degree of obliqueness of the epipolar plane relative to the
118 ground plane. The asymmetry angle is the angle formed between the line perpendicular to, and the line
119 that is the bisector of, the line within the epipolar plane that is parallel to the ground plane (Jeong & Kim,
120 2014; 2016). All three angles affect the horizontal and vertical accuracies of a three-dimensional model.
121 Often, the convergence angle is used to provide a general understanding of the quality of the stereopair
122 geometry for estimating feature heights (Aguilar et al., 2013). The reader is referred to Jeong & Kim
123 2016 for a detailed description of stereopair geometry and their influence on positioning errors.

124 The variation in image acquisition characteristics is a feature of HRSI stereogrammetry that
125 provides both an opportunity and a challenge for estimating surface elevations in a variety of land covers.

126 Given the high spatial resolution (< 1 m) of surface elevation estimates, there is potential for capturing
127 detailed vertical structure in open canopy forests. The challenge lies in identifying the conditions under
128 which features contrast sufficiently with the image background, and understanding both the source of this
129 variation in contrast and the resulting variation in surface elevation measurements.

130 **1.4. Spatial detail in open canopy biome boundary forests**

131 The structure of biome boundary (ecotone) vegetation at the northern limits of the open canopy
132 circumpolar TTE is predicted to change, with important expressions of change controlled by local factors
133 (Bonan, Chapin, & Thompson, 1995; Bonan, Pollard, & Thompson, 1992; Holtmeier & Broll, 2005; Soja
134 et al., 2007). Recent work demonstrates the local scale variability of forest structural change (e.g., height,
135 density and cover) which may be linked to the local spatial pattern of current horizontal and vertical
136 structure of trees (ecotone form) (Harsch & Bader, 2011). At these local scales the effects of topography,
137 wind, disturbance, soil and permafrost characteristics along with long and short term site history
138 (glaciation, fossil treelines, seed availability, soil development, and disturbance) on forest structure
139 patterns are evident, and their relative importance may modify how structure varies across sites (Bunn,
140 Hughes, & Salzer, 2011; Case & Duncan, 2014; Dalen & Hofgaard, 2005; Frost, Epstein, & Walker,
141 2014; Hofgaard & Wilmann, 2002; Kirilyanov, Prokushkin, & Tabakova, 2013; Lloyd, Bunn, & Berner,
142 2011). These current forest structure patterns, captured in fine spatial detail with HRSI, may explain the
143 dynamics of structural change across the open canopy biome boundary forests of the TTE (Danby & Hik,
144 2007; Harper et al., 2011; Harsch, Hulme, McGlone, & Duncan, 2009; Hofgaard, Harper, & Golubeva,
145 2012; Holtmeier, 2009). Thus, the spatial variability in forest structure patterns, the relevance of these
146 patterns to dynamics and the measurement scales needed to capture these patterns across global domains
147 may warrant remote sensing methodologies with HRSI that are tuned to capture vegetation patterns at
148 scales that drive processes. In the TTE, current site-scale patterns of forest structure across the
149 circumpolar domain may be a precursor to predicting the spatial likelihood of TTE forest structure
150 change, or, TTE structure vulnerability (Epstein et al., 2004).

151 The measurement of these important structural patterns are challenging in open canopy forests
152 with contiguous, wide area mapping (Duncanson, Dubayah, Cook, Rosette, & Parker, 2015). Lidar
153 measurements alone can resolve tree-level forest structure, but involve trade-offs between spatial detail
154 and measurement accuracy from limitations imposed by the logistics of airborne and spaceborne data
155 collection schemes. For example, while airborne lidar can provide accurate height and canopy detail, and
156 can be used to scale field observations to those of spaceborne sensors, the spatial coverage of such
157 datasets is limited. Furthermore, these data are currently unavailable for vast expanses of Eurasia's
158 permafrost *Larix* forests. Such constraints result in lidar collections that generally address one of two
159 conflicting needs: high-point-density lidar swaths for collecting fine-scale structure across contiguous
160 regional extents, or large footprint lidar for sampling along transects that extend across biomes and
161 continents. Two near-term spaceborne sampling lidar sensors will either not collect data above 52°N
162 (GEDI, The Global Ecosystems Dynamics Investigation) (Dubayah, Goetz, & Blair, 2014; Stysley et al.,
163 2015) or likely characterize open canopy forest structure with high uncertainty (ICESat-2) (Montesano et
164 al., 2015; Neuenschwander & Magruder, 2016). Thus, the mapping of TTE forest structure patterns
165 across a global-scale biome boundary presents a challenge that will not be met with lidar data alone in the
166 current or near-term.

167 To address this challenge, recent forest structure remote sensing studies have complemented data
168 from spaceborne lidar footprints with imagery. These techniques either spatially group or extend lidar
169 footprint estimates of forest structure (Neigh, Nelson, Ranson, Margolis, et al., 2013b; Nelson et al.,
170 2009; Wulder et al., 2012; Ørka, Wulder, Gobakken, & Næsset, 2012), or link them with image-derived
171 canopy surface elevations (Montesano et al., 2014; 2016; Neigh et al., 2014; 2016; Qi & Dubayah, 2016).
172 Generally, the level of forest structure uncertainty from these techniques is such that they either do not
173 sufficiently resolve site-scale vertical forest structure, or do so only on a per-footprint basis. While
174 uncertainty in structure per se may be a feature of ecological transition zones (Arnot & Fisher, 2007;
175 Hufkens, Scheunders, & Ceulemans, 2009), the subtle structural differences within these zones that
176 describe critical patterns may be required on a continuous (image-level) basis at meter-level spatial scales.

177 **1.5. Objectives**

178 We examined the HRSI DSM estimates of surface elevations in open canopy high-latitude biome
179 boundary forest in the TTE to understand the surface elevation estimates captured in HRSI DSMs from
180 varying stereopair acquisitions. To do this, we applied automated stereogrammetry routines running on a
181 computing cluster to process sub-meter, along-track stereopair imagery across open canopy forests in
182 northern Siberia. We identified multiple sites for which overlapping DSMs were produced. At these sites,
183 we examined (1) the difference in coincident surface elevation measurements derived from imagery
184 acquired under different sun elevation angles in open canopy *Larix* forests, and (2) the potential to exploit
185 sun elevation angle of HRSI acquisitions for capturing continuous (image-based) vertical structure
186 (height) in open canopy forests at scales that reveal important vegetation structure patterns.


187 **2. Methods**

188 **2.1. Study area and reference measurements of tree height**

189 We examined the surface elevation estimates from HRSI stereopair collections with different
190 acquisition characteristics for 5 study sites of open canopy forest in northern Siberia (Fig. 1). The study
191 sites are located along the Kotuykan and Kotuy Rivers in the Putorana Plateau and along the Kheta-
192 Khatanga Plain. These sites include open canopy (discontinuous) forests of exclusively *Larix gmelinii*
193 across an elevation gradient from 0 - 350 m.a.s.l., are near the climatic limit of forest vegetation, and
194 coincide with continuous permafrost and the July 10°C isotherm (Osawa & Kajimoto, 2009). *Larix* trees
195 are found within a vegetation matrix that includes tall shrubs (e.g., *Alnus sp.*, *Betula sp.*, and *Salix sp.*)
196 and dwarf shrubs (e.g., *Vaccinium sp.*) and ground cover that includes sedge-grass, moss, and lichen,
197 constituting a range of albedos. Tree cover is generally sparse and ground cover is typically visible in
198 HRSI within the discontinuous forests.

199 Forest structure measurements were collected in plots along the Kotuykan and Kotuy Rivers in
200 August 2008 (see Montesano et al. 2014, 2016). Plot measurements were coincident with lidar footprints
201 from the Ice, Cloud, and Land Elevation Satellite Global Land Altimeter System (ICESat-GLAS). The

202 plots used as reference in this study (n = 108) were circular, 10 m - 15 m radius, and geo-located with a
 203 horizontal accuracy of +/- 3 m to the centroid of the coincident ICESat-GLAS footprint. In each plot,
 204 individual tree measurements included diameter at breast height (DBH, 1.3 m) for each tree > 3 cm DBH,
 205 and height. Heights were determined with either a clinometer, a laser rangefinder, or empirically with a
 206 linear model relating DBH to height. For each plot, plot-level mean tree height was calculated from its
 207 set of individual tree height measurements.



208
 209 **Figure 1.** The study sites in open canopy forests in northern Siberia. The light grey regions indicate
 210 extents of HRSI DSM coverage, and the 5 dark grey regions indicate the sites (Kheta, Khatanga, Kotuy-
 211 north, Kotuy, and Kotuykan) for which overlap of multiple HRSI DSMs provided areas for further
 212 surface elevation analysis with ICESat-GLAS lidar footprint transects (white lines) and locations of
 213 reference field plots (white circles).

214 **2.2. Regional-scale HRSI data processing**

215 DigitalGlobe provides HRSI at no-direct cost to U.S. Government agencies and non-profit
216 organizations that support U.S. interests via the NextView license agreement (Neigh, Masek, & Nickeson,
217 2013a). These data are typically available as Level 1B products in compressed National Imagery Transit
218 (NTF) format that, because of data volume, can be cumbersome to examine in large numbers (see Shean
219 et al. 2016 for details) on a standard workstation computer. We used the geographic coverage and
220 associated metadata of DigitalGlobe's Worldview-1, and -2 satellites to identify 1° HRSI strips (each ~ 17
221 km x 110 km) that formed along-track stereopairs between 70° N - 73° N and 97° E - 106° E. The strip
222 selection was independent of seasonality, but did focus primarily on including nearly cloud-free data (<
223 20 % cloud cover). These data coincided with areas of open canopy *Larix* forests in and near the TTE.

224 We deployed automated stereogrammetric routines from the NASA Ames Stereo Pipeline (ASP)
225 v. 2.5.1 (Moratto, Broxton, Beyer, Lundy, & Husmann, 2010; Shean et al., 2016) to mass-produce these
226 HRSI stereopair strips in the NASA Center for Climate Simulation's Advanced Data Analytics Platform
227 (ADAPT, <https://www.nccs.nasa.gov/services/adapt>). In the ADAPT computing environment, ASP
228 routines were applied to HRSI stereopair strips according to a workflow similar to that outlined by Shean
229 et al. (2016). The pre-processing and stereogrammetry routines in this workflow were applied to the
230 panchromatic stereopairs. This workflow's preprocessing started with the Level 1B correction of
231 WorldView-1 and -2 images of each stereopair to remove sub-pixel offsets that can result in systematic
232 DEM artifacts. Next, these corrected L1B images with the same catalog ID were mosaicked into image
233 strips with updated sensor model information stored in corresponding .XML files. The stereogrammetry
234 portion of the processing involved 4 stages. The correlation stage first pre-aligned the input images with
235 automatic tie-point detection using ASP's affine epipolar method, then computed the correspondences
236 between the pixel of both input images using a kernel of 21 x 21 pixels (a window ~ 10.4 m - 14.7 m on
237 either side) to match features using ASP's normalized cross correlation algorithm. The sub-pixel
238 refinement stage applied ASP's affine adaptive Bayes expectation-maximization algorithm with a kernel
239 of 21 x 21 pixels, which helped resolve the elevation signals from tree crowns. Filtering helped remove

240 low-confidence values from the previous stage and triangulation produced a three-dimensional point
241 cloud. This point cloud was converted to a DSM at the resolution of the input images, and this DSM was
242 used to orthorectify the more nadir of the two (the “left” image) input stereopair strips. This processing
243 yielded 63 strips of sub-meter HRSI DSM coverage with corresponding orthorectified panchromatic
244 image strips in the regional extent indicated in Figure 1. This set of processed data was used to examine
245 areas of overlap from pairs of two types of DSMs described below.

246 **2.3. Study sites with two types of DSMs**

247 Study areas in open canopy *Larix* forests within northern Siberia were sites for which two types
248 of HRSI DSMs were processed. Each site featured overlap of two types of HRSI DSMs that were
249 described two criteria; the acquisition’s sun elevation angle (the angle of the sun above the horizon) and
250 snow cover. The first DSM type included those DSMs whose stereopairs had been acquired with a low
251 sun elevation angle ($< 25^\circ$; DSM_{sun_low}) and a snow-free ground surface and the second included those
252 acquired with a high sun elevation angle ($> 35^\circ$; DSM_{sun_high}), regardless of snow cover. These criteria
253 excluded those DSMs with low sun elevation angles and snow-covered surfaces from further
254 consideration, removing the Kotuy-north site from the analysis. At each site, DSMs were paired so that
255 each pair consisted of one DSM of each type. At two sites (Kotuy and Kotuykan), a second DSM was
256 available for one of the DSM types, allowing for a second pair. For example, the Kotuykan site had three
257 available DSMs, the DSM_{sun_low} from 6/4/2013 was paired with the DSM_{sun_high} from 6/4/2013 and also
258 with the DSM_{sun_high} from 6/16/2012, resulting in two pairs for that site. The HRSI DSMs were processed
259 with spatial resolutions ranging from 0.5 m - 0.7 m, referenced to the WGS84 ellipsoid, and projected to
260 the local zone (48N) of the Universal Transverse Mercator projection.

261 **2.4. Vertical co-registration of DSM values with lidar surface elevation estimates**

262 The DSMs each have a unique vertical bias (DigitalGlobe 2014). As such, coincident DSMs are
263 offset from one another and require co-registration to vertically align them before their spatially
264 coincident elevation values can be compared. We used coincident ground surface elevation estimates

265 from lidar footprints (nominally 60 m in diameter, spaced 172 m along-track, with a horizontal
266 geolocation accuracy < 4.5 m) from the ICESat-GLAS global land surface altimetry product (GLA14) as
267 control to vertically co-register overlapping DSMs (Zwally et al., 2002; 2014; Duong et al., 2009). The
268 surface elevation estimate for each lidar footprint is derived from the footprint's waveform, which is a
269 representation of the vertical distribution of laser energy returned to the sensor with a 15 cm resolution.
270 The GLA14 product describes this waveform with signal begin and end elevations, and 6 gaussian peaks.
271 The waveform has a length calculated as the distance between the signal beginning and end above a noise
272 threshold that indicates the vertical range across which elevations were recorded within the footprint (Sun
273 et al. 2008). The waveform's first gaussian peak generally provides an estimate of the ground surface
274 elevation. In these sparse forests, this first peak dominates the signal such that the waveform's centroid
275 provides an estimate of near-ground surface elevation, which is assumed to closely represent the DSM's
276 surface elevation estimate. This waveform-derived surface elevation estimate for each lidar footprint
277 provided reference elevations for the DSM co-registration, which was a multi-step spatial and statistical
278 procedure. This procedure involved for each site (1) identifying lidar footprints coincident with the area
279 of intersection between the site's DSMs to provide a basis for co-registration, then (2) calculating a DSM-
280 specific co-registration factor to account for the vertical bias of each DSM using lidar footprints, and (3)
281 applying the co-registration factor to original DSM values.

282 First, we spatially linked DSM elevations to lidar footprints, as follows. For each pair of DSMs,
283 the intersection area common to all DSMs of the pair was identified. Within this area, the surface
284 elevation from each lidar footprint (L_i) was collected from the centroid of each footprint's waveform and
285 registered to the WGS84 ellipsoid ($L_{i, \text{cntrd}}$), the same vertical datum referenced by each DSM. Lidar
286 footprints with a waveform length > 20 m were removed from the dataset to exclude footprints
287 contaminated with clouds or aerosols. For each remaining footprint, a 25 m x 25 m window centered on
288 the footprint's centroid was used to represent each footprint's spatial extent within which we calculated
289 the mean DSM surface elevation, mean DSM slope, and mean DSM aspect. Each footprint's slope and
290 aspect values were derived from each DSM that was coarsened to a pixel size 5% of the input resolution,

291 resulting in a coarsened DSM spatial resolution of 10 m - 14 m to remove the fine-scale slopes associated
292 with elevation changes from individual tree canopies and other small features on the landscape. Since
293 each lidar footprint overlapped multiple coincident DSMs, the slope and aspect values assigned to each
294 footprint were derived from the DSM_{sun_high} of a given DSM pair, and were grouped according to two
295 categories of slopes ($< 10^\circ$ and $\geq 10^\circ$) and four categories of aspect ($>315^\circ$ & $\leq 45^\circ$, *north*; $>135^\circ$ & \leq
296 225° , *south*; $> 45^\circ$ & $\leq 135^\circ$, *east*; $> 225^\circ$ & $\leq 315^\circ$, *west*). Footprints on slopes $\geq 10^\circ$ (~ 3% of
297 footprints) were excluded from further analysis. These lidar-footprint-level calculations were added to a
298 database that included the geographic coordinates of each lidar centroid, the $L_{i, \text{cntrd}}$ value, and the mean
299 DSM elevation, slope, and aspect. This database was linked to a DSM-level database that included
300 information on stereopair acquisition.

301 Second, a gaussian-peak approach was used to co-register elevations from overlapping DSMs.
302 We used lidar as vertical control in an algorithm that estimates a DSM-specific co-registration factor to
303 align DSM ground surfaces, creating a basis for the surface elevation comparisons between overlapping
304 DSMs. For each lidar footprint (L_i), we calculated the difference ($L_{i, \text{dif_lidar}}$) of each footprint's mean
305 DSM value within the 25 m x 25 m window ($L_{i, \overline{DSM}}$) from $L_{i, \text{cntrd}}$ for each DSM coincident with the lidar
306 footprint. The many footprints associated with each DSM provided a distribution of $L_{i, \text{dif_lidar}}$ values.
307 Then, for each DSM, we analyzed the distribution of these $L_{i, \text{dif_lidar}}$ values. We compiled a histogram of
308 each DSM's $L_{i, \text{dif_lidar}}$ values and fit three gaussian curves using the '*normalmixEM*' function in the
309 '*mixtools*' package in R (Benaglia, Chauveau, & Hunter, 2009; R Core Team 2013). This curve-fitting
310 procedure helped to identify sub-groups within each $L_{i, \text{dif_lidar}}$ distribution that were statistically distinct.
311 Each sub-group has a mean difference from $L_{i, \text{cntrd}}$ and was assumed to represent a unique group of
312 surfaces (e.g., near-ground, vegetation) captured by lidar footprint sampling of the DSM values returned
313 from the stereogrammetry analysis.

314 We used the mean of the first gaussian peak ($\mu_{DSM, pk1}$) to identify the sub-group within each $L_{i, \text{dif_lidar}}$
315 $L_{i, \text{dif_lidar}}$ distribution that had the smallest mean difference from $L_{i, \text{cntrd}}$, and used this peak's standard

316 deviation ($\sigma_{DSM,pk1}$) in the following equation for a DSM-specific co-registration factor (CF_{DSM}). The co-
 317 registration factor shown in Equation 1 helps account for the effect that vegetation canopy surfaces may
 318 have on the difference between DSM surface elevations and ground surface control. A value of 3.5 is
 319 used to indicate the far left portion of the distribution that exploratory work suggested was closely
 320 associated with the ground surface:

$$321 \quad CF_{DSM} = \mu_{DSM,pk1} - [3.5 \times \sigma_{DSM,pk1}] \quad \text{Equation 1}$$

322 Third, each CF_{DSM} was applied to systematically shift original mean DSM values summarized in
 323 each lidar footprint. This vertical co-registration of each lidar footprint's DSM value with a reference
 324 near-ground surface provided by $L_{i, cntrd}$ was calculated with Equation 2:

$$325 \quad L_{i,DSM_{cor}} = L_{i,DSM} - CF_{DSM} \quad \text{Equation 2}$$

326 **2.5. Comparison of co-registered DSM values with lidar**

327 After vertical co-registration, we compared $L_{i,DSM_{cor}}$ values of each DSM type across the study
 328 sites. Each site's set of corresponding lidar footprints provided the locations used to compile distributions
 329 of the difference of the co-registered DSM values from reference ground surface elevation as shown in
 330 Equation 3:

$$331 \quad L_{i,ht_{spc}} = L_{i,DSM_{cor}} - L_{i, cntrd} \quad \text{Equation 3}$$

332 The $L_{i,ht_{spc}}$ value is a combined DSM and lidar height measurement. It represents the difference
 333 between a DSM measurement from that of the lidar ground surface and can be used to examine the
 334 heights of features above the ground that the DSM has captured.

335 **2.6. Differencing co-registered DSM values**

336 Equation 4 shows the DSM-differenced height measurement $L_{i,ht_{DSMdiff}}$ calculated for each lidar
 337 footprint. This calculation is arranged according to DSM type, where the sun elevation angle of the HRSI
 338 stereopair acquisition used to compile each DSM dictates how DSM values are differenced. The

339 collection of footprints for which $L_{i,ht_{DSMdiff}}$ was computed was used to examine the distribution of DSM-
340 differenced heights.

$$341 \quad L_{i,ht_{DSMdiff}} = L_{i,DSM_{sun_low}} - L_{i,DSM_{sun_high}} \quad \text{Equation 4}$$

342 The distribution of these DSM-differenced heights was shifted as in Equation 2, using the gaussian-peak
343 approach described in Equation 1. Here, the mean and standard deviation values are derived from the
344 first gaussian peak of the DSM-differenced heights from each pair of DSMs. Each shift is specific to
345 each DSM pair, and was applied to the image-level DSM differencing to map forest heights.

346 **2.7. Classification of lidar footprints**

347 To further understand the surface elevations captured from each DSM type we identified lidar
348 footprints associated with open canopy forest or otherwise. To do this, we classified a portion (33%) of
349 the footprints across the study sites into ‘*forest*’ or ‘*non-forest*’ cover types using the 0.5 m - 0.7 m
350 resolution panchromatic orthorectified imagery associated with each site. The footprints classified as
351 ‘*forest*’ were those determined as being at least partially corresponding to tree cover, while those
352 footprints classified as ‘*non-forest*’ likely featured a mix of ground covers such as lichen, sedge, or low
353 shrubs. This classification allowed for an examination of which lidar footprints likely featured surface
354 elevations influenced by open canopy forest as well as how surface elevations from each DSM type
355 compared within these general cover classes.

356 **3. Results**

357 **3.1. Overview**

358 For our study sites, we summarize the DSM acquisition characteristics. For sites with valid DSM
359 type pairs, we (1) report surface elevation errors, relative to reference lidar-derived footprint surface
360 elevations, for each DSM based on type and terrain aspect, (2) compare distributions of the difference
361 between DSM elevations and reference lidar for each DSM type across all sites and ‘*forest*’ and ‘*non-*
362 *forest*’ classes, and (3) corroborate the distribution of DSM-differences (heights) at reference lidar

363 footprints with field-based plot-level mean tree height measurements and provide examples of DSM-
364 difference maps of open canopy forest height within the study sites.

365 **3.2. DSM acquisition characteristics**

366 In the northern Siberia study region, 17 individual HRSI DSMs across 5 sites of overlap were
367 considered in this analysis (Table 1). Of these 5 sites, 4 featured valid DSM type pairs (DSM_{sun_high} and
368 DSM_{sun_low}) for which the DSM_{sun_high} was free of snow cover (the Kotuy-north site did not). At all 5 sites
369 the surface elevation estimates from individual DSMs with reference lidar ground surface elevation
370 estimates for open canopy *Larix* forests helped explain the surfaces with which elevation measurements
371 from the two types of DSMs were associated.


372 Initial results provided examples of how acquisition characteristics of HRSI may influence DSM
373 results from automated stereogrammetry. In Figure 2, the top row shows a representative subset of
374 panchromatic HRSI from two different WV01 stereopairs collected within ~ 1 day at the same location in
375 open canopy *Larix* forests. Here, vegetation and ground conditions are similar given the near
376 simultaneous acquisition of both stereopairs. The bottom row shows the corresponding color-shaded relief
377 image of the DSM. The left (7/11/2012) and right columns were acquired at high ($> 35^\circ$) and low ($< 25^\circ$)
378 mean sun elevation angles, respectively. This subset from within the Khatanga site provides an example
379 of the DSM types that were used across all sites in this study.

380

381

382 **Table 1.** Summary of HRSI DSM acquisition characteristics and the associated number of lidar footprints
383 at 5 sites with overlap between DSM_{sun_high} and DSM_{sun_low} . The DSMs at the Kotuy-north site were
384 excluded from the subsequent analysis because the site lacked valid DSM type pairs. Note: HRSI DSM
385 names are comprised of satellite platform, acquisition date, and the catalog IDs of each of the two
386 stereopair images (the first catalog ID is conventionally the more nadir of the two). All DSMs across the
387 study sites had convergence angles between 30° and 60° .

<i>HRSI DSM Name</i>	<i>Stereopair Acquisition Date</i>	<i>Site</i>	<i>Condition</i>	<i>Mean Sun Elev. Angle (°)</i>	<i>Lidar footprints (#)</i>
WV01_20120602_102001001A7B6F00_102001001C395800	6/2/2012	Kotuy	snow	42	313
WV01_20120616_102001001B6B7800_102001001A4BEC00	6/16/2012	Kotuykan	snow-free	43	2165
WV01_20120710_102001001CE5F900_102001001CE3A400	7/10/2012	Khatanga	snow-free	8	323
WV01_20120711_102001001C88E300_102001001CDB0B00	7/11/2012	Khatanga	snow-free	41	323
WV01_20120808_102001001C790F00_102001001CE43800	8/8/2012	Kotuy-north	snow-free	36	616
WV01_20121007_102001001DA1E400_102001001F138E00	10/7/2012	Khatanga	snow	13	323
WV01_20130216_102001001FC1D000_10200100212F9F00	2/16/2013	Kotuy-north	snow	7	616
WV01_20130226_102001002163B600_102001001F57B800	2/26/2013	Kotuy-north	snow	11	616
WV01_20130604_102001002138EC00_1020010021AA3000	6/4/2013	Kotuykan	snow-free	8	2165
WV01_20130604_1020010023E3DB00_1020010024C5D300	6/4/2013	Kotuykan	snow-free	42	2165
WV01_20130724_10200100246B6B00_1020010022D9CD00	7/24/2013	Kotuy	snow-free	5	313
WV01_20140307_102001002A803800_102001002ADD4300	3/7/2014	Kotuykan	snow	14	2165
WV02_20130309_1030010020632700_103001002065A800	3/9/2013	Kotuy-north	snow	15	616
WV02_20130719_1030010025AD6800_10300100250F1100	7/19/2013	Kheta	snow-free	9	1022
WV02_20130729_103001002575BC00_1030010024955700	7/29/2013	Kheta	snow-free	37	1022
WV02_20130915_1030010026161400_1030010026B60000	9/15/2013	Kotuy	snow-free	23	313
WV02_20131025_1030010027457800_1030010028BBC900	10/25/2013	Kotuy	snow	7	313



389


390 **Figure 2.** DSMs of the same location from stereopair acquisitions with different sun elevation angles. A
 391 subset of the Khatanga study site for which stereopairs were collected on each of two successive days in
 392 July 2012. The top row shows the panchromatic image for July 11 and 10th, and the bottom row shows
 393 their corresponding color-shaded relief image of the DSM. HRSI acquisition geometry describing the
 394 relative position of the sun and the sensor to the image (target) associated with one image of each
 395 stereopair is shown in the corresponding polar plots. The corresponding images (not shown) for

396 7/11/2012 and 7/10/2012 have satellite elevation and azimuth angles of 64° & 80° and 59° & 308°,
397 respectively.


398 **3.3. Surface elevation errors**

399 DSM elevation errors were derived from linear models built from reference surface elevation
400 estimates from 4,439 lidar footprints, for 17 DSMs across the 5 study sites. For all 17 DSMs, Figure 3
401 summarizes the root mean square error (RMSE) from linear models relating DSM and reference
402 elevations collected at lidar footprints, and distinguishes the 6 DSMs (hollow circles with an 'X')
403 associated with the type DSM_{sun_low} that also featured snow cover (i.e., winter acquisitions, October
404 through March). The magnitude of these RMSEs, by DSM type, are < 0.68 m for DSM_{sun_high} , > 1.0 m for
405 all DSM_{sun_low} and > 1.5 m for those DSMs in DSM_{sun_low} with mean sun elevation angles $< 10^\circ$. Within
406 the DSM_{sun_low} type the outlier with a RMSE of 1.03 m and a mean sun elevation angle of 23° is a mid-
407 September (9/15/2013) acquisition.

408 At the 4 sites with valid DSM type pairs, linear models were computed for 4 terrain aspect
409 categories for all lidar footprints (3,823) associated with each of the 10 valid DSMs at these sites. Figure
410 4 indicates that there is a strong difference between DSM values collected with different sun elevation
411 angles, but little difference across terrain aspect categories. These models were bootstrapped to
412 understand the uncertainty of the distribution of model RMSEs. Bootstrap results suggest that, within
413 each terrain aspect category, there are differences between DSM type in the errors of DSM surface
414 elevation estimates relative to reference lidar ground surface estimates. However, while RMSEs suggest
415 differences between the two DSM types, within each type the terrain aspect category 95% CIs for the
416 model RMSEs generally do not suggest significant differences.



417
 418 **Figure 3.** Comparison of DSM elevation errors with reference lidar elevations. The RMSE values were
 419 derived on a per-DSM basis (each dot corresponds to one DSM) from linear models built from the
 420 relationship of original mean DSM values with reference surface elevations from lidar footprints.
 421 Vertical dashed lines indicate the upper and lower bounds of the DSM_{sun_low} and DSM_{sun_high} types,
 422 respectively.



423
 424 **Figure 4.** Lidar footprints provided reference ground surface elevation estimates to examine the influence
 425 of terrain aspect on DSM errors. The magnitude of the RMSE from the linear model of each DSM's

426 elevations to those of corresponding lidar ground surface are summarized. The error bars (black lines)
427 indicating the bootstrapped 95% confidence interval of the RMSE and number of lidar footprints on
428 which each DSM's model was built are shown for each DSM. Individual DSMs are grouped according to
429 DSM type.


430 **3.4. Vertically co-registered surface elevations**

431 Vertical co-registration was applied to 10 DSMs across the 4 sites. This co-registration amounted
432 to a DSM-specific shift (translation) in elevation values that vertically aligned coincident locations
433 between DSMs using lidar surface elevations as reference. The distribution of surface elevation
434 differences provide an assessment of the surface heights estimated from each DSM type above the
435 assumed ground reference from lidar. These surface elevations differences between DSM types show
436 important differences.


437 In Figure 5, distributions of the differences between co-registered DSM elevations and reference
438 lidar ground surface elevations are grouped by site. These groups reveal a consistency in the difference in
439 surface elevation estimates according to DSM type. The histograms show the distribution of corrected
440 DSM values according to DSM type, for each study site where both DSM types were available. At these
441 sites, distributions of differences between values from DSM_{sun_low} (green bars) and lidar show skewed
442 distributions, reflecting a broad range of differences in surface elevations relative to reference lidar. Those
443 distributions of differences between values from DSM_{sun_high} (brown bars) and lidar are more compact. At
444 2 sites (Khatanga and Kotuykan), Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) tests indicated differences between the
445 distributions from each DSM type are significant ($p < 0.05$). At the 2 remaining sites (Kheta and Kotuy),
446 KS tests did not indicate significant differences in the distributions from each DSM type. While these 2
447 sites feature skewed curves from each DSM_{sun_low} , evidence of vegetation surfaces influencing the
448 difference distribution, they also feature peaks at differences around 1.0 m. These peaks suggest that a
449 large portion of sampling at these sites was done in *non-forest* land cover, where DSMs will feature near-
450 ground surface elevations regardless of sun elevation angle.

451 Surface elevation difference distributions for lidar footprints classified as *'forest'* support the
 452 difference in measurements between the two DSM types. Figure 6 shows a comparison between the
 453 distributions of each DSM type from footprints in two general land cover classes. Footprints from *non-*
 454 *forest* portions of the study area indicate similar distributions (KS test $p > 0.99$). Conversely, footprints
 455 from open canopy forests show significant differences in these distributions (KS test $p < 0.05$). The
 456 difference distribution of the *'forest'* footprints from DSM_{sun_low} (green bars), which represent the forest
 457 height estimates at the lidar footprint locations ($\mu = 6.0$ m, $\sigma = 1.4$), is within 1σ of the distribution of
 458 plot-level mean tree heights (gray bars; $\mu = 6.5$ m, $\sigma = 1.2$ m).

459 Figures 5 and 6 show differences in the distributions of surface elevation differences between
 460 DSM types across sites, and within *'forest'* footprints. These differences, along with the similarity of
 461 spaceborne forest height estimates with those from reference plot measurements suggests that, in open
 462 canopy forests, DSM_{sun_low} are capturing forest surfaces above those of the near-ground surface from the
 463 reference lidar while DSM_{sun_high} provide near-ground surface elevations.



464
 465 **Figure 5.** Comparison of co-registered elevations from DSMs and lidar footprints, by study site. These
 466 relative frequency distributions, grouped according to DSM type, show the difference of co-registered
 467 DSM elevation values from those of reference lidar, for each of the 4 study sites.



468

469 **Figure 6.** Comparison of co-registered elevations from DSMs and lidar footprints, by land cover class.

470 These relative frequency distributions, grouped according to DSM type, show the difference of co-

471 registered DSM elevation values from those of reference lidar, for the set of footprints that were classified

472 into one of two general land cover classes, ‘*forest*’ or ‘*non-forest*’. In the ‘*forest*’ plot, the gray bars

473 represent plot-level mean tree heights.

474 3.5. DSM-differenced heights in open canopy forests

475 Figure 7, showing the DSM-differenced heights at all lidar footprint locations, shows the range of

476 footprint height estimates across the 4 study sites. The left facet combines the distributions of the

477 classified lidar footprints, ‘*forest*’ and ‘*non-forest*’, shown in Figure 6 with ‘*unclassified*’ footprints. The

478 right facet summarizes the distribution of the reference plot-level mean tree heights ($\mu = 6.5$ m, $\sigma = 1.2$

479 m). A general uncertainty in these height estimates is highlighted by the peaks towards the bottom of the

480 left facet associated with footprints labelled ‘*non-forest*’ and ‘*unclassified*’. This general uncertainty

481 reflects the uncertainty in elevation estimates from each DSM, is provided by the RMSE of the


482 DSM_{sun_high} , and represents the error of the surface elevation estimates of the ground. These errors ($<$

483 0.68 m, Figure 3) represent primarily footprints of near-ground surfaces yet show height values > 0 . This


484 uncertainty estimate is a mean on a per DSM basis, and does not include the uncertainty associated with

485 the forest canopy surface from DSM_{sun_low} .

486 Figure 8 shows mapped examples of forest height resulting from image-level DSM differencing.
487 At each study site, forest height is mapped across $\sim 7 \text{ km}^2$ of open canopy forest, and are comprised of
488 pixel-level estimates at a spatial resolution of 2 m. These representative examples show how forest height
489 varies across scales of tens of meters at these sites, and how these variations in height reveal a different
490 forest structure patterns across the maps.



491
492 **Figure 7.** The relative frequency distributions of two types of height observations at lidar footprints. The
493 left facet shows the height distributions from spaceborne DSM-differencing at unclassified, ‘*forest*’ and
494 ‘*non-forest*’ footprints. The right facet shows field-derived plot-level mean tree heights in open canopy
495 forest plots in northern Siberia. The portion of the lidar footprints were classified as ‘*forest*’ and ‘*non-*
496 ‘*forest*’ to underscore the difference in heights from these two groups, and the spaceborne heights are
497 shown adjacent to those from field measurements to illustrate the similarity in forest heights between the
498 two.



499

500

501

502

503

504

Figure 8. Mapped examples, each $\sim 7 \text{ km}^2$, of DSM-differenced heights in open canopy forests in northern Siberia. Forest height estimates are presented at 2 m spatial resolution from image-level DSM differencing applied after vertical co-registration of DSM pairs at each study site. Shown at the spatial scale of large groups of trees, each example shows the pattern of forest structure that is revealed with mapped forest height across sites.

505

4. Discussion

506

4.1. Overview

507

Acquisition sun elevation angle is an important consideration for stereogrammetric estimates of

508

forest structure in open canopies. The combination of HRSI DSMs derived from different solar

509

illumination conditions in open canopies can provide meter-level vertical forest structure

510

information. This structure is captured when a difference in sun elevation angles among overlapping

511

HRSI stereopair acquisitions provides an important source of variation in surface elevation estimates from

512

the resulting DSMs. There are 4 main results from this work. First, within lidar footprints, co-registered

513

HRSI DSM values derived from automated stereogrammetry can produce different surface elevations for

514 a given location within open canopy forests, and terrain aspect categories on slopes $< 10^\circ$ did not result in
515 large differences in errors. Second, in these forests this variability is in part associated with sun elevation
516 angle whereby high angles ($> 35^\circ$) can result in DSMs that are more closely related to near-ground
517 surface elevations (RMSEs < 0.68 m) and low angles ($< 10^\circ$) capture characteristics of the vertical
518 structure of open canopy forests. Third, high latitude DSMs acquired in winter, when sun elevation
519 angles are low and snow covers the ground, can provide an important exception to this general rule in
520 open canopy forests. Fourth, when these two types of DSMs spatially and temporally overlap, the
521 difference of their vertically co-registered values is closely related to vertical vegetation structure (in this
522 case, plot-level mean tree heights) in open canopy forests.

523 Surface elevation estimates from individual DSMs did not vary significantly between terrain
524 aspect categories on slopes $< 10^\circ$. However, within each aspect category the bootstrapped RMSEs of
525 elevation values relative to lidar reference of near-ground surface elevations are consistently larger from
526 individual DSMs collected at low sun elevation angles as compared to those collected at high angles.
527 When broken down by aspect category, these errors support the RMSE results from the level of individual
528 DSMs. These consistently larger errors, relative to lidar reference, from individual DSM_{sun_low} values
529 versus those from DSM_{sun_high} , suggest an influence from aboveground vegetation surfaces on surface
530 elevations computed with automated stereogrammetry. Thus, one feature of the solar geometry at the time
531 of stereopair acquisition (sun elevation angle) may indicate which surfaces, near ground or vegetation, are
532 captured with the elevation estimates from the resulting DSMs in open canopy forests.

533 These vegetation surfaces, particularly tree canopies, influence the image correlation portion of
534 the automated stereogrammetry in ASP, and thus affect elevation measurements under certain
535 circumstances. Automated image correlation looks for similar patterns in image brightness between the
536 left and right images of each stereopair in order to match image pixels corresponding to the same feature.
537 To distinguish a difference in surface elevation of vegetation from the elevation of the ground surface
538 itself, there must be a sufficient difference in image brightness (i.e., contrast) between the feature and the
539 ground to determine parallax (Oleg Alexandrov, personal communication). If the ground and vegetation

540 have similar spectral properties (i.e. brightness) ASP would likely be unable to identify the top of the
541 feature, and thus the surface elevation measurement at the feature's location would be more representative
542 of the ground (background) elevation. Therefore, the contrast in brightness between vegetation and the
543 ground surface primarily determines whether elevations from stereopairs are derived from somewhere at
544 the top or within the canopy, or from the ground. For stereopairs collected at low sun elevation angles,
545 the sun illuminates the sides of tree canopies more directly than the ground surface, producing the
546 contrast needed to distinguish between ground and vegetation. Conversely, when sun elevation angles are
547 high, the contrast between vegetation canopy surfaces and ground typically decreases. This helps produce
548 a smoother DSM where canopy surfaces have a reduced influence on the elevation measurement, and thus
549 the DSM represents a surface more closely related to the ground.

550 From these results in open canopy boreal forests, we recommend filtering stereo acquisitions for
551 high sun elevation angles ($> 35^\circ$) to produce digital terrain models (DTMs) of ground surface elevations,
552 and low sun elevation angles ($< 25^\circ$) to produce DSMs that include surfaces associated with vegetation
553 height. In fact, we note that most of our low sun elevation DSMs were $< 10^\circ$, with only a single DSM
554 outside that range (23°). We also note that these recommendations are potentially limited to the range of
555 observations in this study. In areas where the difference in brightness between vegetation and underlying
556 terrain is affected by snow cover, fire, recovery from fire, differences between understory and overstory,
557 or where canopy covers are relatively closed, these recommendations may not hold. Indeed, results from
558 winter imagery (low sun elevation angles) with complete snow cover yielded inconsistent canopy surface
559 elevations across DSMs when compared to similar types of DSMs derived from snow-free imagery.

560 We note two particular lines of analysis that were not part of this study that could improve our
561 understanding of the utility of HRSI stereopairs and the uncertainties of their estimates of vertical forest
562 structure in open canopies. First, a closer look at the tree canopy cover interval in which the DSM-
563 differencing methodology is applicable should be addressed. This will clarify for which types of open
564 canopies this methodology should be applied, and, importantly, where it will not be able to capture
565 vertical structure. Second, the interaction effects of stereopair SST geometry on height estimates are not

566 entirely clear. Further analysis into the relationships between the contrast in image feature brightness
567 from ground and vegetation, due to either differing illumination angles or shadowing, should be
568 addressed. Such an inquiry would better capture the influence from the orientation of a local plane as
569 well as the horizontal and vertical uncertainties associated with a variety of sun-sensor-target geometries.
570 Such work will improve the use of HRSI DSMs for describing detailed surface feature elevations.

571 **4.2. The advantages of a variety HRSI acquisitions: forest structure at biome boundaries**

572 A variety of spatially coincident HRSI stereopair acquisitions, at both high and low sun elevation
573 angles, provide opportunities to capture detailed vertical structure patterns in open canopy forests across
574 broad spatial scales. Such open canopy forest cover is a feature at forest biome boundaries, where subtle
575 vegetation patterns can reflect ecologically important differences in surface characteristics that are not
576 otherwise apparent in remotely sensed imagery. While differing illumination conditions of images often
577 interfere with the interpretation of land cover type, vegetation health and change, and create a need for
578 solar illumination and terrain correction, such characteristics are a feature of remote sensing data to be
579 exploited with regard to interpreting vegetation structure. In particular, this feature of HRSI can serve the
580 objective of capturing spatially continuous fine-scale estimates of forest structure patterns across broad
581 scales. Ongoing work includes mining the mounting archives of HRSI stereopairs to identify data with
582 optimal solar illumination geometries for open canopy forest structure, and subsequently to sample and
583 map forest structure characteristics at the scale of spatial change across the biome boundaries. This will
584 help to both quantify and refine forest patterns and improve predictions of ecosystem dynamics.

585 **4.3. The implications for mass-production of surface elevation models**

586 Open canopy boreal forests cover large portions of the Arctic, where HRSI surface elevation
587 modelling is ongoing. Such modelling may be able to exploit certain characteristics of solar geometry to
588 target surface features of interest. Our results, which suggest that ground surface can be more closely
589 represented in open canopy forests from acquisitions that coincide with high sun elevation angles, may
590 help refine the HRSI input for such surface modeling. Refining HRSI input may provide a more accurate

591 terrain reference, because the vertical structure of discontinuous forest canopy may be less likely to
592 interfere with stereogrammetric estimates of ground elevations within the context of automated
593 processing. Refining HRSI input within mass-production workflows is provides a powerful combination
594 of large volume processing that identifies the most scientifically useful datasets that exist within vast
595 archives. There is an opportunity to mine the archive of HRSI stereopairs to identify images with
596 acquisition characteristics that are more likely to improve DSM estimates of surfaces of interest, and then
597 prioritize those datasets. This mining strategy can continue to be updated as more is learned about the
598 sources of uncertainty of HRSI data products, and how they can be minimized.

599 **4.4. Relevance of HRSI stereopairs in the observation of biome boundary forests**

600 HRSI stereopairs from passive optical platforms have the potential to fill an important
601 observation gap in the spaceborne observation of biome boundary forests. Not only do these datasets
602 provide spatial resolutions that permit monitoring of forests at fine scales, but they provide this detailed
603 monitoring across global extents. A prominent biome boundary, the boreal-tundra transition forests of the
604 TTE, has a relative dearth of spaceborne data capable of resolving vertical structure in its relatively sparse
605 and short stature forests (the spaceborne lidar dataset from ICESat-GLAS notwithstanding). One primary
606 limitation to their use is the availability of spatial overlap among the types of acquisitions needed for
607 capturing vertical forest structure patterns.

608 Nevertheless, these HRSI data should be part of a data integration scheme for the remote and
609 subtle vegetation structure signals in high northern latitudes. This is due in part to the likelihood that
610 current and near-term missions may either be unable to reach or resolve these regions. The upcoming
611 Global Ecosystem Dynamics Investigation (GEDI) mission will be mounted on the International Space
612 Station, and thus only acquire data up to $\sim 51.5^\circ$ N. ICESat-2 (to be launched ~ 2018) will collect data
613 over the circumpolar boreal domain, but its ATLAS photon counting sensor will only collect a sparse
614 return of photons. Converting these weak lidar returns to vegetation structure information will be
615 challenging. Its primary value, which should not be understated, may likely be to provide added ground

616 surface reference to those existing GLAS estimates, an important complement to HRSI DSMs for
617 purposes of characterizing forest structure. High resolution data (from airborne lidar or HRSI) may
618 provide a basis for testing the ability of ICESat-2 to capture the vegetation canopy in these sparse forests,
619 but political restrictions prevent airborne campaigns from accessing most of the Eurasian boreal.
620 Polarimetric synthetic aperture radar interferometry (eg., from Tandem-X) has advantages over lidar in
621 terms of spatial coverage and has shown promise for providing forest height estimates in boreal regions
622 (eg., Chen et al. 2016, Olesk et al. 2016), but these estimates are at spatial resolutions of tens of meters,
623 an order of magnitude larger than those estimates available from current HRSI stereopairs from passive
624 optical platforms. Therefore these HRSI stereopairs become even more important, allowing us to monitor
625 this changing and challenging ecosystem at the spatial resolution necessary to monitor fine scale
626 processes.

627 This work explains one way in which HRSI stereopairs can address the need for forest structure
628 characterization across broad extents with fine spatial detail. These contributions can become part of a
629 broader strategy that incorporates data from new spaceborne sensors for capturing the patterns of boreal
630 and biome boundary forest structure at critical scales.

631 **5. Conclusions**

632 We applied automated stereogrammetry to stereopairs to produce HRSI DSM estimates of surface
633 elevations in open canopy high-latitude biome boundary forest. Our results show that sun elevation angle
634 at the time of stereopair acquisition influences the stereogrammetric surface elevation estimates, such that
635 there are illumination conditions conducive for capturing elevations of surfaces either near the ground in
636 open boreal canopies or associated with the vegetation canopy. For the open canopy forests across our
637 study sites, the DSMs derived from stereopair acquisitions at sun elevation angles $< 10^\circ$ and also snow-
638 free captured forest canopy surfaces, while those from acquisitions at sun elevations angles $> 35^\circ$
639 captured surfaces more closely associated with the ground (RMSEs < 0.68 m). At each site, these general
640 types of DSMs were co-registered and differenced. Distributions of these height estimates at sample

641 forest locations coincide with reference plot-level mean tree heights ($\pm 1 \sigma$). Knowledge of HRSI
642 acquisition solar geometry and snow cover can be used to understand and combine stereogrammetric
643 surface elevation estimates to co-register and difference overlapping DSMs, providing a means to map
644 forest height at fine scales, resolving the vertical structure of groups of trees from spaceborne platforms in
645 open canopy boreal forests.

646 **6. Acknowledgements**

647 We acknowledge Oleg Alexandrov for the background information he provided on the Ames
648 Stereo Pipeline software, Dan Duffy, Scott Sinno and Garrison Vaughan for their assistance working in
649 the NASA Center for Climate Simulation's ADAPT high performance computing environment, and
650 Viacheslav Kharuk, Sergey Im, Pasha Oskorbin and Mukhtar Naurzbaev for their collaboration with the
651 field expeditions to the Larch forests in northern Siberia. This work was funded by the NASA Terrestrial
652 Ecology Program, grant number NNH13ZDA001N-CARBON.

653

654 **References**

- 655 Aguilar, M. A., del Mar Saldana, M., & Aguilar, F. J. (2014). Generation and quality assessment of
656 stereo-extracted DSM from GeoEye-1 and WorldView-2 imagery. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience
657 and Remote Sensing*, 52(2), 1259–1271.
- 658 Aguilar, M. A., Saldaña, M. M., & Aguilar, F. J. (2013). GeoEye-1 and WorldView-2 pan-sharpened
659 imagery for object-based classification in urban environments. *International Journal of Remote
660 Sensing*. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01431161.2012.747018>
- 661 Arnot, C., & Fisher, P. (2007). Mapping the ecotone with fuzzy sets. *Geographic Uncertainty in
662 Environmental Security*, 19–32.
- 663 Asner, G. (2003). Canopy shadow in IKONOS satellite observations of tropical forests and savannas.
664 *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 87(4), 521–533. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2003.08.006>
- 665 Baltsavias, E., Gruen, A., Eisenbeiss, H., Zhang, L., & Waser, L. T. (2008). High- quality image

666 matching and automated generation of 3D tree models. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*,
667 29(5), 1243–1259. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01431160701736513>

668 Benaglia, T., Chauveau, D., & Hunter, D. (2009). mixtools: An R package for analyzing finite mixture
669 models. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 32(6), 1–29.

670 Berner, L. T., Beck, P. S. A., Loranty, M. M., Alexander, H. D., Mack, M. C., & Goetz, S. J. (2012).
671 Cajander larch (*Larix cajanderi*) biomass distribution, fire regime and post-fire recovery in
672 northeastern Siberia. *Biogeosciences*, 9(10), 3943–3959. <http://doi.org/10.5194/bg-9-3943-2012>

673 Bonan, G. B., Chapin, F. S., & Thompson, S. L. (1995). Boreal forest and tundra ecosystems as
674 components of the climate system. *Climatic Change*, 29(2), 145–167.

675 Bonan, G. B., Pollard, D., & Thompson, S. L. (1992). Effects of boreal forest vegetation on global
676 climate. *Nature*, 359.

677 Bunn, A. G., Hughes, M. K., & Salzer, M. W. (2011). Topographically modified tree-ring chronologies as
678 a potential means to improve paleoclimate inference. *Climatic Change*, 105(3-4), 627–634.
679 <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-010-0005-5>

680 Case, B. S., & Duncan, R. P. (2014). A novel framework for disentangling the scale-dependent influences
681 of abiotic factors on alpine treeline position. *Ecography*, 37(9), 838–851.
682 <http://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.00280>

683 Chen, H., Cloude, S.R., & Goodenough, D.G. (2016). Forest canopy height estimation using Tandem-X
684 coherence data. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*,
685 9(7), 3177 - 3188.

686 Chopping, M. (2011). CANAPI: canopy analysis with panchromatic imagery. *Remote Sensing Letters*,
687 2(1), 21–29. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01431161.2010.486805>

688 Coburn, C. A., & Roberts, A. C. B. (2004). A multiscale texture analysis procedure for improved forest
689 stand classification. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 25(20), 4287–4308.
690 <http://doi.org/10.1080/0143116042000192367>

691 Dalen, L., & Hofgaard, A. (2005). Differential regional treeline dynamics in the Scandes Mountains.

692 *Arctic, Antarctic, and Alpine Research*, 37(3), 284–296.

693 Danby, R. K., & Hik, D. S. (2007). Variability, contingency and rapid change in recent subarctic alpine
694 tree line dynamics. *Journal of Ecology*, 95(2), 352–363. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365->
695 2745.2006.01200.x

696 DigitalGlobe. (2014). Geolocation Accuracy of WorldView Products. *White Paper*, 1–10.

697 Dolloff, J., & Settergren, R. (2010). An assessment of WorldView-1 positional accuracy based on fifty
698 contiguous stereo pairs of imagery. *Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing*, 76(8), 935–
699 943.

700 Dubayah, R., Goetz, S. J., & Blair, J. B. (2014, December). The Global Ecosystem Dynamics
701 Investigation. *AGU Fall Meeting Abstracts*. San Francisco, CA.

702 Duncanson, L. I., Dubayah, R. O., Cook, B. D., Rosette, J., & Parker, G. (2015). The importance of
703 spatial detail: Assessing the utility of individual crown information and scaling approaches for lidar-
704 based biomass density estimation. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 168(C), 102–112.
705 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2015.06.021>

706 Duong, H., Lindenbergh, R., Pfeifer, N., Vosselman, G. (2009). ICESat full-waveform altimetry
707 compared to airborne laser scanning altimetry over The Netherlands. *IEEE Transactions on*
708 *Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 47(10), 3365 - 3378.

709 Epiphanio, J., & Huete, A. R. (1995). Dependence of NDVI and SAVI on sun/sensor geometry and its
710 effect on fAPAR relationships in alfalfa. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 51, 351–360.

711 Epstein, H. E., Beringer, J., Gould, W. A., Lloyd, A. H., Thompson, C. D., Chapin, F. S., et al. (2004).
712 The nature of spatial transitions in the Arctic. *Journal of Biogeography*, 31(12), 1917–1933.

713 Frost, G. V., Epstein, H. E., & Walker, D. A. (2014). Regional and landscape-scale variability of Landsat-
714 observed vegetation dynamics in northwest Siberian tundra. *Environmental Research Letters*, 9(2),
715 025004. <http://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/9/2/025004>

716 Harper, K. A., Danby, R. K., De Fields, D. L., Lewis, K. P., Trant, A. J., Starzomski, B. M., et al. (2011).
717 Tree spatial pattern within the forest–tundra ecotone: a comparison of sites across Canada. *Canadian*

718 *Journal of Forest Research*, 41(3), 479–489. <http://doi.org/10.1139/X10-221>

719 Harsch, M. A., & Bader, M. Y. (2011). Treeline form - a potential key to understanding treeline
720 dynamics. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 20(4), 582–596. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466->
721 8238.2010.00622.x

722 Harsch, M., Hulme, P., McGlone, M., & Duncan, R. (2009). Are treelines advancing? A global meta-
723 analysis of treeline response to climate warming. *Ecology Letters*, 12(10), 1040–1049.

724 Hobi, M. L., & Ginzler, C. (2012). Accuracy Assessment of Digital Surface Models Based on
725 WorldView-2 and ADS80 Stereo Remote Sensing Data. *Sensors*, 12(12), 6347–6368.
726 <http://doi.org/10.3390/s120506347>

727 Hofgaard, A., & Wilmann, B. (2002). Plant distribution pattern across the forest-tundra ecotone: the
728 importance of treeline position. *Ecoscience*, 9(2), 375–385.

729 Hofgaard, A., Harper, K. A., & Golubeva, E. (2012). The role of the circumarctic forest–tundra ecotone
730 for Arctic biodiversity. *Biodiversity*, 13(3-4), 174–181.
731 <http://doi.org/10.1080/14888386.2012.700560>

732 Holtmeier, F. K. (2009). Mountain Timberlines: Ecology, Patchiness and Dynamics. Netherlands: Kluwer
733 Academic Publishers.

734 Holtmeier, F.-K., & Broll, G. (2005). Sensitivity and response of northern hemisphere altitudinal and
735 polar treelines to environmental change at landscape and local scales. *Global Ecology and*
736 *Biogeography*, 14(5), 395–410.

737 Honkavaara, E., Arbiol, R., Markelin, L., Martinez, L., Cramer, M., Bovet, S., et al. (2009). Digital
738 Airborne Photogrammetry—A New Tool for Quantitative Remote Sensing?—A State-of-the-Art
739 Review On Radiometric Aspects of Digital Photogrammetric Images. *Remote Sensing*, 1(4), 577–
740 605. <http://doi.org/10.3390/rs1030577>

741 Hufkens, K., Scheunders, P., & Ceulemans, R. (2009). Ecotones in vegetation ecology: methodologies
742 and definitions revisited. *Ecological Research*, 24(5), 977–986. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11284-009->
743 0584-7

744 Jeong, J., and T. Kim, 2014. Analysis of dual-sensor stereo geometry and its positioning accuracy.
745 *Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing*, 80(7):653-662.

746 Jeong, J., and T. Kim, 2016. Quantitative estimation and validation of the effects of the convergence,
747 bisector elevation, and asymmetry angles on the positioning accuracies of satellite stereo pairs.
748 *Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing*, 82(8):625-633.

749 Kane, V., Gillespie, A., McGaughey, R., Lutz, J., Ceder, K., Franklin, J., 2008. Interpretation and
750 topographic compensation of conifer canopy self-shadowing. *Remote Sens. Environ.* 112 (10):3820–
751 3832. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2008.06.001>.

752 Kayitakire, F., Hamel, C., & Defourny, P. (2006). Retrieving forest structure variables based on image
753 texture analysis and IKONOS-2 imagery. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 102(3-4), 390–401.
754 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2006.02.022>

755 Kimes, D. S. (1983). Dynamics of directional reflectance factor distributions for vegetation canopies.
756 *Applied Optics*, 22(9), 1364–1372.

757 Kirilyanov, A. V., Prokushkin, A. S., & Tabakova, M. A. (2013). Tree-ring growth of Gmelin larch under
758 contrasting local conditions in the north of Central Siberia. *Dendrochronologia*.
759 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.dendro.2012.10.003>

760 Korpela, I., Heikkinen, V., Honkavaara, E., Rohrbach, F., & Tokola, T. (2011). Variation and directional
761 anisotropy of reflectance at the crown scale — Implications for tree species classification in digital
762 aerial images. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 115(8), 2062–2074.
763 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2011.04.008>

764 Lagomasino, D., Fatoyinbo, T., Lee, S.-K., & Simard, M. (2015). High-resolution forest canopy height
765 estimation in an African blue carbon ecosystem. *Remote Sensing in Ecology and Conservation*, 1(1),
766 51–60. <http://doi.org/10.1002/rse2.3>

767 Lamonaca, A., Corona, P., & Barbati, A. (2008). Exploring forest structural complexity by multi-scale
768 segmentation of VHR imagery. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 112(6), 2839–2849.
769 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2008.01.017>

770 Lloyd, A. H., Bunn, A. G., & Berner, L. T. (2011). A latitudinal gradient in tree growth response to
771 climate warming in the Siberian taiga. *Global Change Biology*, *17*(5), 1935–1945.
772 <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2010.02360.x>

773 Mallinis, G., Koutsias, N., Tsakiri-Strati, M., & Karteris, M. (2008). Object-based classification using
774 Quickbird imagery for delineating forest vegetation polygons in a Mediterranean test site. *ISPRS*
775 *Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing*, *63*(2), 237–250.
776 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2007.08.007>

777 Manninen, T., Korhonen, L., Voipio, P., Lahtinen, P., & Stenberg, P. (2009). Leaf Area Index (LAI)
778 Estimation of Boreal Forest Using Wide Optics Airborne Winter Photos. *Remote Sensing*, *1*(4),
779 1380–1394. <http://doi.org/10.3390/rs1041380>

780 Montesano, P. M., Rosette, J., Sun, G., North, P., Nelson, R. F., Dubayah, R. O., et al. (2015). The
781 uncertainty of biomass estimates from modeled ICESat-2 returns across a boreal forest gradient.
782 *Remote Sensing of Environment*, *158*, 95–109. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2014.10.029>

783 Montesano, P. M., Sun, G., Dubayah, R. O., & Ranson, K. J. (2016). Spaceborne potential for examining
784 taiga–tundra ecotone form and vulnerability. *Biogeosciences*, *13*(13), 3847–3861.
785 <http://doi.org/10.5194/bg-13-3847-2016>

786 Montesano, P., Sun, G., Dubayah, R., & Ranson, K. (2014). The Uncertainty of Plot-Scale Forest Height
787 Estimates from Complementary Spaceborne Observations in the Taiga-Tundra Ecotone. *Remote*
788 *Sensing*, *6*(10), 10070–10088. <http://doi.org/10.3390/rs61010070>

789 Moratto, Z. M., Broxton, M. J., Beyer, R. A., Lundy, M., & Husmann, K. (2010). Ames Stereo Pipeline,
790 NASA's open source automated stereogrammetry software. *41st Lunar and Planetary Science*
791 *Conference Abstracts*.

792 Neigh, C. S. R., Masek, J. G., Bourget, P., Rishmawi, K., Zhao, F., Huang, C., et al. (2016). Regional
793 rates of young US forest growth estimated from annual Landsat disturbance history and IKONOS
794 stereo imagery. *Remote Sens. Environ.* *173* (C):282–293. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2015.09.007>

795 Neigh, C. S., Masek, J. G., & Nickeson, J. E. (2013a). High- Resolution Satellite Data Open for

796 Government Research. *Eos, Transactions American Geophysical Union*, 94(13), 121–123.

797 Neigh, C. S., Nelson, R. F., Ranson, K. J., Margolis, H. A., Montesano, P. M., Sun, G., et al. (2013b).
798 Taking stock of circumboreal forest carbon with ground measurements, airborne and spaceborne
799 lidar. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 137, 274–287. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2013.06.019>

800 Neigh, C., Masek, J., Bourget, P., Cook, B., Huang, C., Rishmawi, K., & Zhao, F. (2014). Deciphering
801 the Precision of Stereo IKONOS Canopy Height Models for US Forests with G-LiHT Airborne lidar.
802 *Remote Sensing*, 6(3), 1762–1782. <http://doi.org/10.3390/rs6031762>

803 Nelson, R., Ranson, K. J., Sun, G., Kimes, D. S., Kharuk, V., & Montesano, P. (2009). Estimating
804 Siberian timber volume using MODIS and ICESat/GLAS. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 113(3),
805 691–701. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2008.11.010>

806 Neuenschwander, A., & Magruder, L. (2016). The Potential Impact of Vertical Sampling Uncertainty on
807 ICESat-2/ATLAS Terrain and Canopy Height Retrievals for Multiple Ecosystems. *Remote Sensing*,
808 8(12), 1039. <http://doi.org/10.3390/rs8121039>

809 Olesk, A., Praks, J., Antropov, O., Zalite, K., Arumae, T., & Voormansik, K. (2016). Interferometric SAR
810 coherence models for characterisation of hemiboreal forests using Tandem-X data. *Remote Sensing*,
811 8, 700 - 723

812 Osawa, A., & Kajimoto, T. (2009). Development of Stand Structure in Larch Forests. In *Permafrost*
813 *Forests* (Vol. 209, pp. 123–148). Dordrecht: Ecological Studies. [http://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-](http://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9693-8_7)
814 [9693-8_7](http://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9693-8_7)

815 Ozdemir, I., & Karnieli, A. (2011). Predicting forest structural parameters using the image texture derived
816 from WorldView-2 multispectral imagery in a dryland forest, Israel. *International Journal of Applied*
817 *Earth Observations and Geoinformation*, 13(5), 701–710. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2011.05.006>

818 Persson, H., Wallerman, J., & Olsson, H. (2013). Estimating forest biomass and height using optical
819 stereo satellite data and a DTM from laser scanning data. *Canadian Journal of Remote Sensing*,
820 39(3), 251 - 262.

821 Poon, J., Fraser, C., & Zhang, C. (2007). Digital surface models from high resolution satellite imagery.

822 *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing*, 73(11), 1225 - 1231.

823 Qi, W., & Dubayah, R. O. (2016). Combining Tandem-X InSAR and simulated GEDI lidar observations
824 for forest structure mapping. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 187, 253–266.
825 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2016.10.018>

826 R Core Team (2013). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
827 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. ISBN 3-900051-07-0, URL <http://www.R-project.org/>.

828 Ranson, K. J., Daughtry, C., & Biehl, L. L. (1985). Sun-view angle effects on reflectance factors of corn
829 canopies. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 18, 147–161.

830 Shean, D. E., Alexandrov, O., Moratto, Z. M., Smith, B. E., Joughin, I. R., Porter, C., & Morin, P. (2016).
831 ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing. *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and*
832 *Remote Sensing*, 116(C), 101–117. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2016.03.012>

833 Soja, A., Tchebakova, N., French, N., Flannigan, M., Shugart, H., Stocks, B., et al. (2007). Climate-
834 induced boreal forest change: predictions versus current observations. *Global and Planetary Change*,
835 56(3-4), 274–296.

836 Sun, G., Ranson, K.K., Kimes, D.S., Blair, J.B., & Kovacs, K. (2008). Forest vertical structure from
837 GLAS: an evaluation using LVIS and SRTM data. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 112(1), 107-117.

838 Stysley, P. R., Coyle, D. B., Kay, R. B., Frederickson, R., Poulos, D., Cory, K., & Clarke, G. (2015).
839 Long term performance of the High Output Maximum Efficiency Resonator (HOMER) laser for
840 NASA's Global Ecosystem Dynamics Investigation (GEDI) lidar. *Optics and Laser Technology*,
841 68(C), 67–72. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.optlastec.2014.11.001>

842 Vega, C., & St-Onge, B. (2008). Height growth reconstruction of a boreal forest canopy over a period of
843 58 years using a combination of photogrammetric and lidar models. *Remote Sensing of Environment*,
844 112(4), 1784–1794. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2007.09.002>

845 Wang, L., Sousa, W. P., Gong, P., & Biging, G. S. (2004). Comparison of IKONOS and QuickBird
846 images for mapping mangrove species on the Caribbean coast of Panama. *Remote Sensing of*
847 *Environment*, 91(3-4), 432–440. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2004.04.005>

848 Widlowski, J. L., Pinty, B., & Gobron, N. (2001). Detection and characterization of boreal coniferous
849 forests from remote sensing data. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *106*(D24), 33–405–33–419.

850 Wolter, P. T., Townsend, P. A., & Sturtevant, B. R. (2009). Estimation of forest structural parameters
851 using 5 and 10 meter SPOT-5 satellite data. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, *113*, 2019–2036.
852 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2009.05.009>

853 Wulder, M. A., Hall, R. J., & Coops, N. C. (2004). High spatial resolution remotely sensed data for
854 ecosystem characterization. *Bioscience*, *54*(6), 511–521.

855 Wulder, M. A., Ortlepp, S. M., & White, J. C. (2008). Impact of sun-surface-sensor geometry upon
856 multitemporal high spatial resolution satellite imagery. *Canadian Journal of Remote Sensing*, *34*(5),
857 455–461.

858 Wulder, M. A., White, J. C., Nelson, R. F., Næsset, E., Ørka, H. O., Coops, N. C., et al. (2012). lidar
859 sampling for large-area forest characterization: A review. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, *121*, 196–
860 209. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2012.02.001>

861 Zwally, H. J., Schutz, B., Abdalati, W., Abshire, J., Bentley, C., Brenner, A., et al. (2002). ICESat's laser
862 measurements of polar ice, atmosphere, ocean, and land. *Journal of Geodynamics*, *34*(3), 405–445.

863 Zwally, J. H., Schutz, R., Bentley, C., Bufton, J., Herring, T., et al. (2014). GLAS/ICESat L2 Global Land
864 Surface Altimetry Data, Version 34. NASA National Snow and Ice Data Center Distributed Active
865 Archive Center. <http://doi.org/10.5067/ICESAT/GLAS/DATA227>

866 Ørka, H. O., Wulder, M. A., Gobakken, T., & Næsset, E. (2012). Subalpine zone delineation using lidar
867 and Landsat imagery. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, *119*(C), 11–20.
868 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2011.11.023>

869

870