# Satellite-based optical water classifications in global oceans

Jianwei Wei

<sup>1</sup> NOAA/NESDIS/STAR, Satellite Oceanography and Climatology Division <sup>2</sup> Global Science & Technology, Inc.

## Acknowledgments

## **Collaborators:**

Menghua Wang	– NOAA/STAR					
Karlis Mikelsons	– NOAA/STAR					
Lide Jiang	– NOAA/STAR					
Susanne Kratzer	<ul> <li>University of Stockholm</li> </ul>					
Zhongping Lee	<ul> <li>University of Massachusetts at Boston</li> </ul>					
Tim Moore	<ul> <li>Harbor Branch Oceanographic Institute</li> </ul>					
Heidi M. Sosik	<ul> <li>Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution</li> </ul>					
Dimitry Van der Zande – Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences						















## **Funding sources:**

NOAA; Joint Polar Satellite System (JPSS)



#### A complex system

Credit: NASA SVS

high

## Water classifications started with human-eye observations...



- ✓ It consists of 21 scales designed by Forel (1890) and Ule (1892)
- $\checkmark$  It is the first attempt to divide the oceans based on their colors
- ✓ It has accumulated the longest ocean optical records (>100 years)



✓ First quantitative classifications: I-III for open oceans, 1-9 for coastal oceans

✓ Occasionally used in the ocean color remote sensing and ocean modeling systems

## Case 1 & Case 2 classifications Recommended readings: Morel & Prieur (1977); Mobley (2004) Phytoplankton Phytoplankton CDOM & detritus **CDOM & detritus**

- ✓ It is this classification that has been frequently referred to in various presentations
- ✓ It played an important role for bio-optical modeling and the development of the ocean color satellites
- ✓ No clear demarcation line to separate Case 1 and Case 2 waters

## Satellite ocean color data



## **Priority problems**

#### ✓ Compatible/applicable



#### ✓ Reliable

#### ✓ Comparable

This requires the classifications are insensitive to the number of wavelengths of the satellite sensors



#### ✓ Distinguishable

The resultant water classes are ideally distinctive from each other



## Hyperspectral data



✓ Training data consist of in situ measurements and simulations

## Hyperspectral clusters (k = 23) based on spectral similarity

✓ Cosine distance between two individual nRrs spectra is computed:

 $d = 1 - \frac{\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{B}}{\|\mathbf{A}\| \|\mathbf{B}\|} \quad .$ 



## Model implementation with SNPP VIIRS









## Satellite water classes data are online

https://www.star.nesdis.noaa.gov/socd/mecb/color/ocview/ocview.html



## Validations with in situ and satellite matchups





## Variation and distinction of bio-optical properties (based on the SNPP VIIRS 2012-2020 data)



 $a_{pq}$ : total absorption coefficient

*b<sub>bp</sub>*: backscattering coefficient of particles

*a<sub>ph</sub>*: absorption coefficient of phytoplankton

 $a_{dq}$ : absorption coefficient of CDOM & detritus

## Variation and distinction of bio-optical properties (based on the SNPP VIIRS 2012-2020 data)



*Chl-a*: chlorophyll-a concentration

 $a_{ph}^{*}$ : Chl-a specific absorption

*K<sub>d</sub>*: diffuse attenuation coefficient

SPM: suspended particulate matter

## Water classes from multispectral satellites



Northeast coastal oceans of the US and Canada

#### Wavelength

Sentinel 3A OLCI: 400, 413, 443, 490, 510, 560, 620, 665, 674, 681 nm SNPP VIIRS: 410, 443, 486, 551, 671 nm

#### **Spatial resolution**

Sentinel 3A OLCI: 300 m SNPP VIIRS: 750 m

## Water classes from hyperspectral & multispectral satellites

Lake Erie



HICO: >50 visible bands; 90 m resolution VIIRS: 5 visible bands; 750m resolution

## Water classes from hyperspectral & multispectral satellites

Chesapeake Bay



## Models vs. satellite Rrs spectra



#### **Percentage differences**

Class	410	443	486	551	670
1	0.5%	-0.9%	-2.1%	7.0%	103.0%
2	0.7%	-1.5%	-0.9%	19.8%	121.4%
3	4.2%	-3.0%	-4.8%	14.1%	99.8%
4	4.0%	-1.6%	-4.8%	5.8%	68.2%
5	-1.4%	3.2%	-1.0%	-4.9%	34.9%
6	4.8%	-0.2%	-5.4%	2.1%	34.3%
7	-3.7%	2.6%	1.7%	-5.6%	13.4%
8	7.0%	0.8%	-3.8%	-3.6%	14.9%
9	-12.5%	1.5%	5.0%	-3.1%	13.4%
10	-2.6%	0.9%	0.1%	0.1%	15.5%
11	9.0%	1.9%	-7.2%	-3.5%	-12.6%
12	-17.2%	3.3%	8.6%	-5.6%	4.1%
13	4.8%	0.3%	-4.5%	-0.3%	-2.7%
14	-6.4%	3.6%	5.2%	-4.2%	-1.0%
15	-39.6%	-1.6%	9.4%	-1.1%	-25.2%
16	-4.8%	2.2%	-0.9%	-0.9%	1.9%
17	-24.7%	4.2%	7.0%	-2.3%	1.5%
18	-92.1%	-10.1%	5.4%	3.0%	-41.9%
19	-9.6%	18.9%	9.3%	-3.6%	-3.7%
20	-98.9%	1.0%	14.2%	-3.3%	-0.8%
21	3.3%	3.2%	-2.9%	-1.3%	1.7%
22	-95.2%	-13.0%	-0.7%	2.7%	-3.2%
23	-97.2%	-5.3%	12.3%	0.0%	-2.9%

## **Coherency between water classes & water bio-optical properties**



20



Time series (monthly)

## **Coherency between water classes & water bio-optical properties**

**Spatial variation** 



#### Time series (monthly)





## Satellite water classes as ocean ecological provinces



### **Ocean subtropical gyres quantified as "Class 1" waters**



Month of year

## Summary

- 1. Experimental data products of the optical water classes are being routinely generated from VIIRS.
- 2. The resultant water classes have distinctive bio-optical properties and are reliable.
- 3. A hyperspectral classification model is developed based on the spectral similarity of Rrs.
- 4. Decades-long (and consistent) time series of water classes can be created from the suite of satellite missions.
- 5. Case analyses are demonstrated for potential applications.

#### **Publication**

Wei, J., M. Wang, K. Mikelsons, L. Jiang, S. Kratzer, Z. P. Lee, T. Moore, H. M. Sosik, and D. Van der Zande (2022), Global satellite water classification data products over oceanic, coastal, and inland waters, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, *282*, doi: <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2022.113233</u>.

#### Backup slides



#### Variances of nRrs



## **Uncertainties associated with atmospheric correction**



- □ An error ( $\varepsilon$ ) was added to  $nR_{rs}(\lambda)$  at one wavelength only for each simulation.
- □ Minor errors in  $nR_{rs}(\lambda)$  (i.e., ±10% in this study) exert minimal influence on the resulting water classes.
- □ When errors reach  $\pm$  30% and  $\pm$  50%, the uncertainties in the water class products can increase substantially.
- □ In extremely clear waters, such as Class 1–3, the blue bands play a major role in the water class uncertainties.
- □ In contrast, the green and red bands are relatively more important in the opposite end of the water classes, such as Class 19–23.
- □ Subplot "g" shows excessive negative errors -100% added to nRrs. However, error-disturbed  $nR_{rs}(410)$  do not significantly increase the water class uncertainty for Class 15, 17, 18, 20-23.

## **VIIRS-generated water classes**



Browse the experimental water classes data at OCView (Ocean Color Viewer):

https://www.star.nesdis.noaa.gov/socd/mecb/color/ocview/ocview.html