



# Automating the detection of disturbances to aquatic resources



Melanie Vanderhoof<sup>1</sup>, Jay Christensen<sup>2</sup> , Nora Hwang<sup>3</sup>, Christine Mazzarella<sup>4</sup>, Megan Lang<sup>5</sup>

U.S. Geological Survey, GECSC, Denver, CO U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 3 U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

U.S. Department of the Interior **U.S. Geological Survey** 

## Project Motivation

- Global trends in wetland degradation and loss have created an urgency to:
	- 1. Monitor wetland extent and,
	- 2. Track the distribution and causes of wetland loss.
- Satellite imagery can be used to monitor wetlands over time.
- Few efforts have attempted to distinguish anthropogenic wetland loss from climate-driven variability in wetland extent.







# Approach

- Tracked inundation extent and land cover disturbance across the Mid-Atlantic region using the Landsat archive in Google Earth Engine.
- How to best remotely detect anthropogenic wetland loss (due to land cover change)?
	- Decrease in inundation extent?
	- Disturbance extent?
	- Co-location of inundation decline and disturbance?



#### remote sensing

Isolating Anthropogenic Wetland Loss by Concurrently Tracking Inundation and Land Cover Disturbance across the Mid-Atlantic Region, U.S.

Melanie K. Vanderhoof <sup>1, s</sup>. Jay Christensen<sup>2</sup>, Yen-Ju G. Beal<sup>1</sup>, Ben DeVries<sup>3,4</sup><sup>0</sup>, Megan W. Lang<sup>5</sup>, Nora Hwang<sup>6</sup>, Christine Mazzarella<sup>7</sup> and John W. Jones<sup>8</sup>

- Geosciences and Environmental Change Science Center, U.S. Geological Survey, Denver, CO 80225, USA: vgbeal@usgs.gov
- $2.1$ Office of Research and Development, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Cincinnati, OH 45220, USA; christensen.iav@epa.gov
- Department of Geography, Environment and Geomatics, University of Guelph, Guelph, ON N1G 2W1. Canada; bdv@uoguelph.ca
- Department of Geographical Sciences, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20740, USA
- National Wetlands Inventory Program, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Falls Church, VA 22041, USA; megan\_lang@fws.gov
- Region 5, Water Division, Wetlands Section, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Chicago, IL 60604, USA; hwang.nora@epa.gov
- Region 3, Water Division, Wetlands Branch, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Philadelphia, PA 19103, USA; mazzarella, christine@epa.gov
- Hydrologic Remote Sensing Branch, U.S. Geological Survey, Leetown, WV 25430, USA; jwjones@usgs.gov
- Correspondence: mvanderhoof@usgs.gov; Tel.: +1-303-236-1411

Received: 26 March 2020; Accepted: 1 May 2020; Published: 5 May 2020



Abstract: Global trends in wetland degradation and loss have created an urgency to monitor wetland extent, as well as track the distribution and causes of wetland loss. Satellite imagery can be used to monitor wetlands over time, but few efforts have attempted to distinguish anthropogenic wetland loss from climate-driven variability in wetland extent. We present an approach to concurrently track land cover disturbance and inundation extent across the Mid-Atlantic region, United States, using the Landsat archive in Google Earth Engine. Disturbance was identified as a change in greenness, using a harmonic linear regression approach, or as a change in growing season brightness. Inundation extent was mapped using a modified version of the U.S. Geological Survey's Dynamic Surface Water Extent (DSWE) algorithm. Annual (2015-2018) disturbance averaged 0.32% (1095 km<sup>2</sup> year<sup>-1</sup>) of the study area per year and was most common in forested areas. While inundation extent showed substantial interannual variability, the co-occurrence of disturbance and declines in inundation extent represented a minority of both change types, totaling 109 km<sup>2</sup> over the four-year period, and 186 km<sup>2</sup>, using the National Wetland Inventory dataset in place of the Landsat-derived inundation extent. When the annual products were evaluated with permitted wetland and stream fill points, 95% of the fill points were detected, with most found by the disturbance product (89%) and fewer found by the inundation decline product (25%). The results suggest that mapping inundation alone is unlikely to be adequate to find and track anthropogenic wetland loss. Alternatively, remotely tracking both disturbance and inundation can potentially focus efforts to protect, manage, and restore wetlands.

Keywords: Chesapeake Bay; wetland fill; harmonic regression: Landsat; permit; surface water



 $(2015 - 2018)$ 

to 2 previous years

Temporal Extent: 2015-2018

 $(2012 - 2019)$ 

Brightness change

Earth Engine

260% increase in GS

IF NOT:

Reclassified as

undisturbed

(2) Output: Annual

disturbance extent

 $(2015 - 2018)$ 

 $(2015 - 2018)$ 

### Spatial Extent:



# Annual Inundation (2013-2018)

- Uses Landsat ETM+ (n=1036), OLI (n=1086) images across study area.
- Applied USGS Dynamic Surface Water Extent (DSWE) algorithm to ETM+



- Advantage: unsupervised algorithm
- Modified DSWE algorithm for OLI
	- Additional test for forested wetlands
	- Reduced commission error for suburban areas



## Regional surface water mapping challenges



Lots of forest (60%) – limited surface visibility



Appalachian Mts create severe topographical shadowing



Multiple urban areas – D.C., Baltimore, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Virginia Beach, Richmond



Delmarva Peninsula – high frequency of ephemeral wetlands



Lots of dynamic tidal wetlands



# Response to regional challenges and big data challenges





- (a) January  $1 -$  May 31
- ≥2 observations of inundation

classes

(b) Mask out slopes >7%.

• All DSWE confidence

(c) If high-confidence DSWE water class → retain everywhere, otherwise, require more observations in uplands.

(d) Intersect a NWI polygon

# Algorithm maps sub-pixel inundation

- Surface water depends on:
	- 1. DSWE water confidence class
	- 2. Number of inundation observations per year
	- 3. Ecoregion (lowland, upland)



3530W 35230W white w WAYN MITCH  $36.76.00\%$  $150$  keV as on proper the control consumy  $\sim$   $\sim$ 

# Mapping Disturbance

1a. Harmonic NDVI change analysis (17,956 images)

1b. Increase in brightness (7,213 images)







<u>La</u>



## Disturbance Output Examples

- 60% in NLCD forest (e.g., silviculture, development)
- 14% in NLCD developed classes intensification of development
- 15% in NLCD agriculture (conversion from ag to development, or error)





# Product Validation

### **Inundation Extent:**

- Landsat ETM+ inundation: 18% OE, 1% CE
- Landsat OLI inundation: 19% OE, 4% CE
- **ETM-OLI combined inundation: 13% OE, 4% CE**
- **MMU** (1176 wetlands in WorldView imagery):
	- 61% wetlands  $(0.4 1.0 \text{ ha})$
	- 84% wetlands  $(1.0 1.5)$  ha)

### **Disturbance Extent:**

- Disturbance (Harmonic): 27% OE, 2% CE
- Disturbance (Brightness): 56% OE, 1% CE
- **Disturbance (B-H combined): 15% OE, 2% CE**



**USACE Section 404 Permits (permitted aquatic resource loss (n=263))**

• **Detected 95% of USACE water fill points** (71% disturbance only, 6% inundation loss only, 18%, disturbance and inundation loss)

# Products applied to examine aquatic resource loss

- Inundation loss (decline relative to previous 2 years) represented 7-11% of total inundation.
- Disturbance extent represented 0.25% (2016) to 0.35% (2015) of the study area.
- 99% of annual "inundation loss" occurred without a disturbance event (i.e., climate variability).



# Patterns of disturbance and potential aquatic resource loss were uneven across the SA.

- A total of  $108.6 \text{ km}^2$  (2015-2018) showed both disturbance and inundation loss.
- A total of 186 km<sup>2</sup> (2015-2018) intersected NWI polygons and disturbance.



**Disturbance density** 

Inun. Loss-Disturb.

### So what can we do with this information?

- **Goal:** Enable stakeholders to make informed, strategic decisions in a cost-efficient manner.
- **Inundation:** where is the water? What water is relatively stable? What water is most dynamic and most susceptible to changes in climate (e.g., droughts, floods)
- **Disturbance:** where are changes in vegetation actively occurring? Where are changes minimal? Can this help us identify at risk regions or aquatic resource types?
- **Disturbance – NWI wetlands:** what aquatic resources are potentially at-risk? Where can we prioritize restoration needs?





Tracking disturbance and inundation to identify wetland loss

### **Dates**

**Start Date:** 2015-01-01 2018-12-31 End Date: **Publication Date:** 2020-06-16

### Citation

Vanderhoof, M.K., Christensen, J., Beal, Y.J.G. DeVries, B., Lang, M.W., Hwang, N., Mazzarella, C., and Jones, J.W., Tracking disturbance and inundation to identify wetland loss: U.S. Geological Survey data release, https://doi.org/10.5066/P9ODILGN.

### Summary

Global trends in wetland degradation and loss have created an urgency to monitor wetland extent, as well as track the distribution and causes of wetland loss. Satellite imagery can be used to monitor wetlands over time, but few efforts have attempted to distinguish anthropogenic wetland loss from climate-driven variability in wetland extent. We present an annroach to gonourrantly track land gover disturbance and invadation ovtant across the Mid Atlantic region. United

### $Map \gg$



**I** View <del>•</del>

### Communities

 $\leftarrow$ 

#### C sciencebase.gov/catalog/item/5e430b15e4b0edb47be845ce  $\rightarrow$

### Tracking disturbance and inundation to identify w...

U.S. Geological Survey - ScienceBase Distributor: Geosciences and Environmental Change Science Center **SDC Data Owner: Land Resources USGS Mission Area:** 

### Attached Files 4-

 $(2015 - 2018)$ 

Click on title to download individual files attached to this item or **L** download all files listed below as a compressed file.



### **Related External Resources**

#### **Type: Related Primary Publication**

Vanderhoof, M.K.; Christensen, J.; Beal, Y.-J.G.; DeVries, B.; Lang, M.W.; Hwang, N.; Mazzarella, C.; Jones, J.W. Isolating Anthropogenic Wetland Loss by Concurrently Tracking Inundation and Land Cover Disturbance across the Mid-Atlantic Region, U.S.. Remote Sens. 2020, 12, 1464

https://www. mdpi.com/20 72-4292/12/ 9/1464

**E** View <del>▼</del>

**门** 

 $\times$ 



![](_page_18_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_0.jpeg)

a tarrisonburg<sub>es</sub>

Layers

Map Satellite

![](_page_21_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Figure_0.jpeg)

2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019

![](_page_24_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_24.jpeg)

 $\bullet$ 

 $\rightarrow$ 

Ŀ

Map

![](_page_28_Picture_39.jpeg)

 $\bullet$   $\prime$   $\bullet$   $\prime$   $\bullet$ 

CASTER

**Wall** 

式击

# Example from Leesburg, VA

![](_page_29_Figure_1.jpeg)

## Project and Product Summary

- 1. Disturbance, inundation extent, and the co-location of the 2 have applications for monitoring and managing wetland extent and condition.
- 2. Published products and code can be used as a jumping off point and adapted to work across different regions.

![](_page_30_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_6.jpeg)

# Thank You! Questions?

Melanie Vanderhoof - mvanderhoof@usgs.gov

**Products – ScienceBase:**

https://www.sciencebase.gov/catalog/item/5e430b15e4b0edb47be845ce

**Code – GitLab:** https://code.usgs.gov/gecsc/tracking-disturbance-and-inundation-to-identify-wetland-loss/- /tree/master

Research Presented Funded by:

EPA Region 3 EPA Region 3 RARE Program USGS, Land Change Science Program

![](_page_31_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Figure_0.jpeg)