NH43B-1885

Intelligent Observation Strategies for Geosynchronous Remote Sensing for Natural Hazards Background Image Source: Contaminated Rio Doce Water Flows into the Atlantic taken on 30 Nov. 2015 by Landsat 8. NASA Earth Observatory image by J. Stevens, SSC-Jacobs. Websit

Abstract

Geosynchronous satellites (orbiting in the same rotation period as the Earth) offer a unique perspective for monitoring environmental factors, and for those in the geostationary orbit (circular, equatorial orbits 35.7 km above the surface) 24 hour monitoring is possible. The NRC 2007 decadal survey for NASA Earth science proposed the GEO-CAPE mission to address coastal and air pollution events in geostationary orbit, complementing similar initiatives by the South



atellites in Geostationary Orbit (www.dreamer-cs.com

and by ESA in Europe, effectively covering the northern hemisphere. Commercial communication satellites are envisioned to provide a platform for instruments capable of



Koreans in Asia

sensing the GEO-CAPE measurements. The Tropospheric Emissions: Monitoring of Pollution (TEMPO) will measure atmospheric pollution covering most of North America hourly at high spatial resolution from geostationary orbit. This NASA Earth Venture instrument will take advantage of a GEO host spacecraft to improve emission inventories, monitor population exposure, and enable effective emission-control strategies for modest mission costs.

This poster addresses the results of a NASA study to explore observation strategies to fully exploit both this unique observing viewpoint and new technologies enabling the rapid acquisition and delivery of environmental data products important to understanding natural hazards and supporting the disasters management life cycle.



Study Objectives

The goal of the GEO-CAPE oceans observation optimization feasibility study was to research options for an overall observing strategy to maximize the ocean science return. The study identified key scientific benefits such as improved time and quality of observations, and compared costs and benefits of potential strategies. Specifically: Examine/develop needs analysis driving ocean instrument operations concepts

- Determine ways to optimize observations with respect to cloud avoidance
- Describe the high-level cost/benefit tradeoff for candidate observation strategies



Instrument Scheduling Environment Assumptions

Filter Radiometer (FR) and Coastal Ocean Ecosystem Dynamics Imager (COEDI) were two candidate instrument concepts for the study.

	FR	COEDI	:)
Resolution	375m	375m	+
Sc <mark>e</mark> ne Size	512 x 512km	768 x 535.5km	
Scene	197.5	304.15	
Storage	MB	MB	
High 30min Repeat	11 scenes	8 scenes	South Pacific Ocean
Threshold	22	17	FR Sce
1hr	scenes	scenes	
CONUS	18	15	• Host
Coverage	scenes	scenes	• Oper
Data Rate	1.25 MB/s	1.46 MB/s	hours
Daily	65.7	102.2	• 60 m
Storage	GB	GB	
Monthly	1.97	3.1	• Targe
Downlink	TB	TB	

Operations Factors

Ground FR Forecast Schedule Example based on cloud threshold criteria per region and actual forecasts for June 15, 2015. New Schedule







www.geocape.herokuapp.com



Karen Moe, Emeritus - karen.moe@nasa.gov Earth Science Technology Office NASA Goddard Space Flight Center Patrice Cappelaere - pat@cappelaere.com Vightel Corporation Stuart Frye - stuart.w.frye@nasa.gov Stinger Ghaffarian Technologies, Inc.

https://ntrs.nasa.gov/searcl Jacqueline LeMoigne ewart@nas Daniel Mandl -Thomas Flatley -Alessandro Geist -**AETD Software Engine** NASA Goddard Space



ene Layout:

- ed Instrument @95W ate during daylight – 16 s/day
- ev Mode (red)
- in repeat frequency
- line 30 min) eted events (blue)
- nce team sets cloud
- thresholds and priorities

20:00	21:00	22:00	23:00	24:00	0:00	1:00	2:00	3:00	4:00	5:00
0.65	0.52	0.4	0.24	0.01	U	0	0	0.11	x	X
					0.01	0.21	0.06	0.24	X	X
					0.00			×	×	×
	0.05	0.74	0.97		0.71	0.47	0.55	X	×	X
	0.0	0.20	0.27		0.05	[×]	×	[×]	-	
0.04	0.14	0.26			v.00	Ŷ	Ŷ	Û.		1
0	0	0	0	0	x	x	x	-	_	
0	0	0	0	0	x	x	x	_	-	_
0.13	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.01	x	x	x	-	-	-
0.64	0.62	0.7	0.82	0.87	х	x	x	-	-	-
					0.85	x	x	-	-	-
					0.89	х	х	-	-	-
					0.67	х	х	х	-	-
					0.9	х	х	-	-	-
					х	х	х	-	-	-
	0.54	0.67	0.87	0.96	х	х	х	-	-	-
0	0	0	0	0	х	х	х	-	-	-
	0.21	0.22	0.28		х	х	х	-	-	-
					х	х	х	-	-	-
0.73	0.65	0.74	0.9	1	х	х	х	-	-	-
3	3	3	4	5	1	1	2	1		
3	5	5	3	5		1	2	1		
15	13	13	14	16	9	2	2			
21	21	21	21	21	10	4	4	2		
								-		

Contraction of the				
	Band #	Centra I W (nm)	BW (nm)	Spatial Res (m)
1	1	443	20	60
	2	490	65	10
id)	3	560	35	10
	4	665	30	10
	5	705	15	20
	6	740	15	20
1	7	783	20	20
Mask ation)	8	842	115	10
	8b	865	20	20
	9	945	20	60
	10	1380	30	60
	11	1610	90	20





- Red scenes fail cloud threshold
- Green scenes pass scheduled • Orange scenes are marginal and are scheduled for more evaluation onboard
- Daily schedule includes Green and Orange scenes uplinked to the instrument



FR Scene Sub-grids Enable Cloud Forecast Optimization for **Onboard Cloud Detection**

- Forecast is obtained at the center of the sub-area of interest and is averaged across scene to generate the scene forecast; land masks can also be used
- Orange marginal scenes are acquired, and onboard cloud detection is employed to determine if cloud threshold is met; if so, observation is downlinked; if not delete to reduce data handling costs

Onboard Cloud Detection Algorithms

Key Findings

Hosted payload operations concepts a 24/7 monitoring at high resolution, data to mitigate with onboard processing. **Observation Operations Simulator den** benefits for several intelligent observat

- Daily (or every 6 hour) forecast sche settings and forecast constraints; ma
- Onboard processing of cloud detecti observations that pass cloud thresh costs)

 Cost effective onboard processing a The emerging Internet of Things (IoT) opportunity to evolve payload data pro by a user's smart phone or other smar

References

- J. Al-Saadi et al, GEO-CAPE 2009-2015 Sur cape.larc.nasa.gov/pdf/GEO-CAPE_2009-2
- N. Memarsadeghi, "A Review of Landsat-7 ar Algorit15hms," on the Imagepedia section of t https://imageseer.nasa.gov/imagepedia n2011.pdf
- M. Griffin, H. Burke, D. Mandl, and J. Miller EO-1 Hyperion Imagery" in 2003 IEEE Intern Sensing Symposium (IGARSS), July 2003, vo
- T. Doggett, R. Greeley, S. Chien, R. Castano R. Sherwood, D. Tran, V. Baker, J. Dohm, and cryospheric change with hyperion on-board Ea Environment, Vol. 101, Issue 4, April 2006, pa S. Ackerman et al ("Discriminating Clear-Sky"
- Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document, 2010 Global Cloud Cover for Assessment of Optica
- A HyspIRI Case Study, M. Mercury, R. Green Environment journal 126 (2012) 62-71

Spectral Wavelength	(Microns)	0.	1	0.4	0.	5 0	.6 0	0.7	1.	0 1	1.3		2.	0		3.0	4.0) 5.0) (5.0	7.0) 8.	0 9	.0 1	0.0 11
Instrument (Spat. Resol.)	Number of Bands		Ultra Violet		Vi	sible	e		Near	-IR			Mid-I	R				I		1			TI	nermal-IR	R
Landsat-7 (30 m)	7 Bands				1	2	3		4		1	5		7		2) 0.52-0.6 3) 0.63-0.6	9	4) 0.76-0.9 5) 1.55-1.7	90 6) 1 75	0.4-12.5				[
Landsat-8 (80 m)	11 Bands				12	3	8 4		5		9	6		7		3) 0.53-0.5 4) 0.64-0.6	59 57	5) 0.8 6) 1.5	5-0.88 7-1.65	1	9) 1. 0) 10	.36-1.38).60-11.19	11)	11.50-12.51	10
EO/1 Hyperion (30 m)	220 Bands					2.	1 31		51	11	10	123	150.		-[Central Wa 51) 0.86; 1	avele 110)	engths: 21) 0 1.25; 123) 1.).56; 31) 0. 38; 150) 1.	66; 8 65 0		5)	1.55-1.75 2.08-2.35		T
EO/1 Multispectral (30 m)	7 Bands				r 1	2	3	4	4'	5'		5		7		 2) 0.52-0. 3) 0.63-0. 	60 69	4) 0.76-0. 5) 1.55-1.	.81 .75	T					
GOES (1 km:1, 4km:2,4&5, 8km	5 Bands n:3)			_			1		2) 4)	3.80-4 10.2-1	.00 1.2	5) 1 6) 1	1.5-12.5 2.9-13.7	_			2			3					4
MODIS (250m:1&2,500m: 3-7,1000m:8-36)	36 Bands	1 2 5 6 7	0.62-0.67 0.84-0.88 1.23-1.25 1.63-1.65 2.11-2.16	89) 3 ¹ 0	4 1 & 1 1 2	1 314	15	2 16 to 19	5	2 6	6		7		20	2 1 & 2 2 2	24 20) 3.66- 26) 1.36- 31) 10.78	-3.84 -1.39 8-11.28	27	28	8	29	30	3
GEO-CAPE OPTIC	INS						1	1			1		I					1		1				I	
Roll Cameras (2) (375 m)	1 Band/for each camera				1		Centra	al Wave	elengt	h: 1) 0	.50									1					-
Filter Radiometer (FR) (375 m)	50 Bands					0.3	- 3 - 1.05	; ; 	ı	1.2 45			1.6 4	2.1 35			1				T				

Spectral Bands Used in Cloud Detection Algorithms

- Landsat-7 bands: 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 (Thermal IR) for 30m resolution cloud detection
- GOES bands: 2, 4, 5, 6 for 4km resolution • EO-1/Hyperion bands: 21, 31, 51, 110, 123, 150, also 30m
- Thermal bands distinguish clouds from ice
- SWIR band 1375nm (used by EO-1 / Landsat-8 / Sentinel 2) is the most critical to detect high cirrus clouds that contaminate scenes, especially in coastal areas



EO-1 Onboard Cloud Detect

The Hyperion image is on the masks clouds (orange) and identifies non-cloudy (blue) and ice covered surface (pink), and was processed using the EO-1 onboard cloud detection algorithm. • Hyperion Scene size: 361.6k scanline length (pixels)*12

- bands
- Time to process cloud detection code: 0.6 s (0.172 s
- with level 1 compiler optimization • Scaling the instrument scene size to the FR dimensions
- would require ~3 s to process (with no optimization), compared to the 157 s required to acquire the scene

.jsp?R=20150023590 2019-08-31T04:38:13+00:00Z
acqueline.j.lemoigne- mandl@nasa.gov s.p.flatley@nsas.gov a.gov ring Division light Center
T
1
re still evolving. While offering
SEC's GEO-CAPE
nonstrated the feasibility and
ion strategies:
duling; cloud threshold
arginal scene handling
on to only downlink
side (the reduce data handling
vailable with 2015 technology
echnology provides an
ducts to be readily accessible
appliance.
5 SummativeWhitePaper.pdf
d EO-1 Cloud Detection
ne IMAGESEER website,
pedia_7_CioudDetection_Nargess_J
Cloud Cover Detection Algorithm for
tional Geoscience and Remote
B. Cichy, A. G. Davies, G. Rabideau,
F. Ip, "Autonomous detection of
arth Observing-1", Remote Sensing of des 447-462.
rom Cloud with MODIS," MODIS
et al Remote Sensing of
1.0 12.0 13.0 14.0 15.0
6
11
6) 10.4-12.5
1 32 33 34 35 36
Ion
ien. The resulting product