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Fire and Smoke Remote Sensing and Modeling Uncertainties:
Case Studies in Northern Sub-Saharan Africa

Charles Ichoku,1 Luke T. Ellison,2 Yun Yue,3 Jun Wang,3,4 and Johannes W. Kaiser5

ABSTRACT

Significant uncertainties are incurred in deriving various quantities related to biomass burning from satellite measurements at different scales, and, in general, the coarser the resolution of observation the larger the uncertainty. WRF-Chem model simulations of smoke over the northern sub-Saharan African (NSSA) region for January–February 2010, using fire energetics and emissions research version 1.0 (FEERv1) aerosol emissions derived from MODIS measurements of fire radiative power (FRP) and aerosol optical depth (AOD), resulted in a severe model underestimation of AOD compared with satellite retrievals. Such uncertainties are attributable to three major factors: limitations in the spatial and temporal resolutions of the satellite observations used to quantify emissions, modeling parameters and assumptions, and the unique geographic characteristics of NSSA. It is recommended that field campaigns involving synergistic coordination of ground-based, airborne, and satellite measurements with modeling be conducted in major and complex biomass burning regions such as the NSSA, and that significant improvements in the spatial and temporal resolutions of observation systems needed to reduce uncertainties in biomass burning characterization be seriously considered in future satellite missions.

14.1. INTRODUCTION

Wildfires and other types of open biomass burning represent one of the most ubiquitous disturbances to vegetated land ecosystems globally [e.g., Andreae, 1991; Ichoku et al., 2008a, 2012]. These vegetation fires are either ignited by natural processes such as lightning or by human action such as arson, accident, prescribed (controlled) burning for land management, or societal cultural practices as applicable to game hunting, slash-and-burn agriculture, and other forms of land clearing. Whatever the nature or purpose of ignition, depending on circumstances, such open fires can easily become hazardous to life and property. The hazardous effects of fires are not limited to the destructive effects of the associated flame and heat [e.g., Cohen, 2010], but also extend to the potential adverse impacts of the emitted smoke on air quality and human health both near and far [e.g., Colarco et al., 2004; Wang et al., 2006; Wiedinmyer et al., 2006; Henderson et al., 2011], as well as those of the postburn land surface processes that may include erosion, landslides, mud deposits, and pollution of water resources by soot and other residues [e.g., Moody et al., 2013].

Determination of the areas and quantities of biomass consumed by fires, and their resulting emissions and impacts, can be done at local to global scales, depending on the targeted application(s) and the available tools and resources [e.g., Michalek et al., 2000; Ichoku and Kaufman, 2005; Roberts et al., 2005; van der Werf et al., 2006, 2010; de Groot et al., 2007; Poulbot et al., 2008; Schultz et al., 2008; Vermote et al., 2009; Giglio et al., 2010; Roy et al.,
Irrespective of the approach or scale, such exercises are generally associated with a wide range of uncertainties, which are partly because of the dynamic and intractable nature of biomass burning processes, and partly due to the imperfections in the measurement approaches and modeling assumptions used. Measurement methods may be ground based, airborne, or satellite based. Ground-based methods are typically used for localized measurements with high precision over a short time period, whereas satellite methods can be applied regionally or globally for an extended time period albeit with a lower accuracy and precision. Based on the analysis of burned areas retrieved from multiple satellite sensors during 1997–2008, it was estimated that between 330 and 430 Mha were burned annually globally, of which ~250 Mha (i.e., ~70%) was estimated to have burned each year on the continent of Africa alone [Giglio et al., 2010]. These numbers were used, within the Global Fire Emissions Database version 3 (GFED3) framework, to estimate that the global annual carbon emissions from open biomass burning for 1997–2009 was in the range of 1.6 Pg C yr⁻¹ to 2.8 Pg C yr⁻¹, with an annual average of 2.0 Pg C yr⁻¹, of which Africa alone contributes ~52% [van der Werf et al., 2010]. Although the emission uncertainties associated with such satellite-based global estimates are large, they can be even larger at regional scales. For instance, Zhang et al. [2014] found a factor of 12 difference when comparing seven satellite-derived fire emissions inventories for February 2010 in the northern sub-Saharan African (NSSA) region. Therefore, although the current paper will examine these uncertainties from a global perspective, case studies will be mainly based on data from the NSSA region, which comprise mostly savanna fires [e.g., Gatebe et al., 2014].

Some of the main uncertainties in quantifying biomass burning parameters stem from a variety of factors, including the difficulty in addressing the following questions: (1) Where and when exactly does a fire occur? (2) What are the mass loadings and conditions of the biomass fuel? (3) What is the fire intensity and/or size? (4) What are the relative proportions of the fire phases (flaming, smoldering, and glowing) per unit area and how does this distribution vary in space and time? (5) How long does a given fire burn, and how does it affect (and is it affected by) environmental conditions? (6) How far does a given fire spread, when is an area considered burned, and what is the total burned area when the fire ends? (7) How much smoke is emitted per unit time from a given fire? (8) How high is the plume injected and how far is it spreading? (9) What are the important constituents of the smoke and what are their respective concentrations? (10) How do smoke constituents interact with one another and with other atmospheric constituents to change and/or form new ones over time? (11) How do the characteristics of different fires in similar ecosystems differ? (12) What are the fire diurnal cycle and the seasonal burn pattern in a given area or region?

These questions are not an exhaustive list of the essential questions concerning the quantification of biomass burning characteristics and emission constituents. Yet no single measurement or modeling approach can address any of them to the required accuracy at various spatial and temporal scales. For instance, although ground-based and airborne systems can be used for limited active fire measurements at high temporal frequency over an extended part of a day, only portions of the fire or smoke can be observed at any given time. Conversely, satellite measurements can cover much larger regions or even the entire globe, but only for a smaller set of parameters at a much reduced spatial resolution and/or temporal frequency, depending on whether the satellite is geostationary or polar orbiting. Ideally, the ability to address most of the above questions to an acceptable level of accuracy should involve proper synergy between the different (ground-based, airborne, and satellite) measurement approaches and appropriate modeling systems [e.g., Schroeder et al., 2014a].

This study addresses uncertainties related to the satellite approach, which has become more and more widely used for fire characterization and emissions estimation at local to global scales. It is recognized that satellite observation systems are numerous and varied, thereby offering a similarly diverse range of capabilities for remote sensing of fires and smoke. However, the pyrolysis and emissions processes of biomass burning are extremely dynamic and continuous, and cannot be adequately followed by satellite observations, which can only provide highly discretized and sparse (both spatially and temporally) sampling of such processes. This gap in observation resulting from the intrinsic sampling intervals of different satellite systems represents a significant fundamental uncertainty in biomass burning characterization. Furthermore, even at the satellite sampling times, errors of omission or commission do occur, imposing another layer of uncertainty. These uncertainties related to non-observation of existing fires or false alarms on nonexistent fires, typically quantified in terms of errors of omission and commission, respectively, have been quite extensively investigated in the literature [e.g., Ichoku et al., 2003; Li et al., 2003; Morissette et al., 2005; Csizsar et al., 2006, 2014; Schroeder et al., 2008; Freeborn et al., 2014]. Therefore, this study focuses on uncertainties of measured parameters of actually observed fires, burned areas, and smoke constituents.

The objective of this study is to investigate uncertainties associated with the satellite characterization of biomass burning, as they relate to the derived geophysical
products such as smoke constituents and their applications. These uncertainties will be examined in the context of the 12 basic relevant questions outlined above. To anchor this study to contemporary reality, the analysis will be limited to satellite observation systems that are currently (or have been recently) operational, and known to provide data products that are related to biomass burning (Table 14.1). Then, we will explore how the observation uncertainties can propagate when used in deriving smoke emissions as well as in regional modeling. The conclusions will include an outlook on the potential for integration of available airborne and ground-based measurements to improve results.

14.2. METHODS

Satellite measurements related to biomass burning may be categorized into five groups of parameters, namely: active fires, burned surfaces, smoke plume dispositions, aerosol distribution and particle properties, and trace gas concentrations [Ichoku et al., 2012]. Whereas parameters of “active fires” (i.e., fire location, fire temperature and area, and fire radiative power [FRP]) and those of “burned surfaces” (i.e., burned area and burn severity proxy indices such as the differenced normalized burn ratio [dNBR]) are uniquely retrievable from satellite measurements within the limitations of remote sensing uncertainties [e.g., Roy et al., 2006, 2008; French et al., 2008; Roy and Boschetti, 2009; Freeborn et al., 2011; Randerson et al., 2012; Hyer et al., 2013; Miettinen et al., 2013; Mouillot et al., 2014], direct satellite retrieval of smoke constituents is somewhat more ambiguous because they are often mixed with similar particulate and gaseous constituents from nonfire sources [e.g., Deeter et al., 2003; Kaufman et al., 2005]. Therefore, at regional to global scales, the most frequent use of satellite active-fire and burned-area products is for the estimation of smoke emissions, which are subsequently applied to various uses, including air quality and climate modeling [e.g., Heald et al., 2003; Kasischke and Bruhwiler, 2003; Kukavskaya et al., 2013].

The amount of a specific carbonaceous aerosol or trace gas species emitted as a smoke constituent is traditionally derived as follows [e.g., Lavoué et al., 2000; Andreae and Merlet, 2001]:

\[ M_x = EF_x \times M_{\text{biomass}} \]  

where \( M_x \) is the mass of the emitted smoke constituent \( x \), \( EF_x \) is its emission factor, and \( M_{\text{biomass}} \) is the mass of the dry biomass burned. \( M_{\text{biomass}} \) can be estimated as follows [Seiler and Crutzen, 1980]:

\[ M_{\text{biomass}} = A \times B \times \alpha \times \beta \]  

where \( A \) is the burned area, \( B \) is the biomass density, \( \alpha \) is the fraction of aboveground biomass, and \( \beta \) is the fraction consumed or combustion completeness.

Typically, \( EF_x \) is derived from laboratory or field experimentation, whereas \( A, B, \alpha, \) and \( \beta \) are derived through satellite or airborne remote sensing, though they can be based on hybrid approaches. Although most current global and regional models employ emissions derived on the basis of equations (14.1) and (14.2), there are numerous uncertainties associated with this approach, particularly with regard to the accuracy of determination of the constituent parameters: \( EF_x, A, B, \alpha, \) and \( \beta \), as well as the error propagation that results when they are combined [e.g., French et al., 2004].

In an effort to alleviate the complexity imposed by requiring the solution of equation (14.2) as a prerequisite to solving equation (14.1), Ichoku and Kaufman [2005] established a similar relationship to equation (14.1), in which \( EF_x \) is replaced with \( C_x^i \), which is designated as the emission coefficient (for any given smoke constituent \( x \)), and \( M_{\text{biomass}} \) is replaced with either fire radiative energy (FRE) or its release rate \( R_{\text{fr}} \) (i.e., FRP). Thus:

\[ M_x = C_x^i \times \text{FRE} \]  

or

\[ R_x = C_x^i \times R_{\text{fr}} \]  

where \( R_x \) is the rate of emission of species \( x \) (expressed in kg/s) since \( R_{\text{fr}} \) is the FRE release rate expressed in MJ/s, or MW. \( C_x^i \) is therefore expressed in kg/MJ. The validity of the relationship in equation (14.3) has been verified in a laboratory experiment, where satellite measurements of fire energetics and smoke were replicated by burning small biomass fuel samples in a burn chamber equipped with a giant smoke stack upon which the relevant instruments were set up, and the retrieved FRP and AOD were used to derive \( C_x^i \) for smoke aerosols [Ichoku et al., 2008b].

Based on equation (14.3), a new emissions dataset, known as the fire energetics and emissions research version 1.0 (FEERv1), has been developed from Terra- and Aqua-MODIS measurements of FRP and AOD [Ichoku and Ellison, 2014]. FEER.v1 is composed of a global gridded \( C_x^i \) dataset at \( 1^\circ \times 1^\circ \) grid spatial resolution for smoke aerosols and a number of other important constituents. These gridded \( C_x^i \) values for smoke aerosols were applied to equation (14.3) together with FRE data obtained through time integration of MODIS FRP measurements that have been gridded at 0.5° × 0.5° resolution within the Global Fire Assimilation System [GFASv1.0; Kaiser et al., 2012]. The resulting daily emissions of smoke aerosols are then utilized as input into the Weather Research and Forecasting coupled with
Table 14.1 Selected Current or Recent Satellite Sensors Providing Observations of Fires and Smoke That Are Relevant to This Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satellite/sensor name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Spatial resolution</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Reference (e.g.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quickbird</td>
<td>High-resolution satellite-borne sensors</td>
<td>2–4 m</td>
<td>2001–present</td>
<td>Barbosa et al. [2014]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikonos</td>
<td>High-resolution satellite-borne sensors</td>
<td>4 m</td>
<td>1999–present</td>
<td>Barbosa et al. [2014]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landsat</td>
<td>Satellite series carrying the Thematic Mapper (TM) or enhanced TM (ETM) sensors</td>
<td>30 m</td>
<td>1979–present</td>
<td>Chander et al. [2009]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTER</td>
<td>Advanced Spaceborne Thermal Emission and Reflection Radiometer</td>
<td>15 m, 30 m, 90 m</td>
<td>1999–present</td>
<td>Abrams, [2000]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODIS</td>
<td>Moderate-resolution Imaging Spectro-radiometer aboard Terra and Aqua</td>
<td>0.25 km, 0.5 km, 1 km</td>
<td>1999–present 2002–present</td>
<td>Xiong et al. [2009]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIIRS</td>
<td>Visible–Infrared Imaging Radiometer Suite on the Suomi National Polar-Orbiting Partnership (NPP) satellite</td>
<td>375 m, 750 m</td>
<td>2011–present</td>
<td>Hillger et al. [2013]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRD</td>
<td>Bi-spectral Infra-Red Detection on a German Space Agency (DLR) small satellite</td>
<td>185 m, 370 m</td>
<td>2001–2004</td>
<td>Lorentz et al. [2013]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TET-1</td>
<td>Technologie Entwicklungstraeger on a German Space Agency (DLR) small satellite</td>
<td>42.4 m, 356 m</td>
<td>2012–present</td>
<td>Lorentz et al. [2013]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIOP</td>
<td>Cloud-Aerosol Lidar with Orthogonal Polarization on the Cloud-Aerosol Lidar and Infrared Pathfinder Satellite Observations (CALIPSO) satellite</td>
<td>5 km</td>
<td>2006–present</td>
<td>Winker et al. [2009]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISR</td>
<td>Multi-angle Imaging Spectro-Radiometer aboard Terra</td>
<td>0.275 km, 1.1 km</td>
<td>1999–present</td>
<td>Diner et al. [2005]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVHRR</td>
<td>Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer</td>
<td>1 km</td>
<td>1978–present</td>
<td>Ichoku et al. [2003]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOT-VGT</td>
<td>The VEGETATION sensor aboard the European SPOT-4 satellite</td>
<td>1 km</td>
<td>1998–present</td>
<td>Tansey et al. [2004]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOES</td>
<td>Sensors aboard the Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite series</td>
<td>4 km</td>
<td>1994–present</td>
<td>Zhang and Kondragunta [2008]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEVIRI</td>
<td>Spinning Enhanced Visible and Infrared Imager aboard the European Meteosat</td>
<td>3 km</td>
<td>2004–present</td>
<td>Roberts and Wooster [2008]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOPITT</td>
<td>Measurements of Pollution in the Troposphere aboard the Terra satellite</td>
<td>22 km</td>
<td>1999–present</td>
<td>Deeter et al. [2003]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIRS</td>
<td>Atmospheric Infrared Sounder aboard the Aqua satellite</td>
<td>90 km</td>
<td>2002–present</td>
<td>Warner et al. [2007]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TES</td>
<td>Tropospheric Emission Spectrometer aboard the Aura satellite</td>
<td>5×8 km</td>
<td>2004–present</td>
<td>Luo et al. [2007]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIA</td>
<td>SCIAMACHY on the European ENVISAT</td>
<td>30×120 km</td>
<td>2003–present</td>
<td>Buchwitz et al. [2006]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOSAT</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gases Observing Satellite</td>
<td>10.5 km</td>
<td>2009–present</td>
<td>Yokota et al. [2009]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The cited reference for each is just an example and not necessarily the official reference.
Chemistry (WRF-Chem) regional model for simulation of biomass burning aerosol emissions and dispersion over the NSSA region [Zhang et al., 2014]. The WRF-Chem AOD simulations are compared against MODIS-derived AOD for January and February 2010.

14.3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Uncertainties associated with satellite measurements can vary widely because fires occur in different ecosystems at various scales under a diversity of conditions. Table 14.2 provides a summary of uncertainties associated with some of the satellite-based measurements of fire- and smoke-related variables, as obtained from literature, classified according to the 12 essential questions identified in the introduction, and expressed under different ranges of sensor spatial resolutions (very high: 0.001–0.01 km, high: 0.01–0.1 km, medium: 0.1–1 km, coarse: 1–10 km, and very coarse: 10–100 km), for ease of reference. These sensor-resolution classifications were determined based on a reasonable assessment of typical contemporary satellite instruments used for regional-global remote sensing. The reported uncertainty value ranges represent rough averages (not actual arithmetic means) estimated from the variety of values and plots published in the respective cited references. Overall, it is noticeable that uncertainties not only differ by variable but also by resolution, generally getting worse the coarser the resolution, as can be observed in cases represented in at least two spatial resolution categories. From the partial distribution of values in Table 14.2, it is obvious that most of the variables related to active fires and burned areas are observed at medium to coarse resolutions, whereas those associated with smoke are observed at coarse to very coarse resolutions. Analysis of global fire distributions has shown that lower FRP fires (which can be either relatively small hot fires or cooler fires of various sizes) occur much more frequently than larger ones in virtually all regions of the world [e.g., Ichoku et al., 2008a]. Thus, most fire-related variables are observed at resolutions that are much coarser than their scale of occurrence, thereby contributing to the uncertainty. Also, because of the temporally discrete nature of satellite observations, time-dependent fire and emissions characteristics such as fire duration, smoke emission rates, and transformations are not directly retrieved, though when the fires are large enough to be observed from geostationary satellites, it may be possible to determine fire duration. Otherwise, such time-dependent phenomena are typically derived through postproduction modeling that incorporates additional parameters from other sources.

One of the outcomes of the survey in Table 14.2 is that all satellite retrievals are subject to significantly large uncertainties (underestimation and overestimation). However, at each scale, fire radiative power (FRP) appears to be more prone to underestimation relative to higher resolutions [Wooster et al., 2003; Roberts and Wooster, 2008]. Burned area (BA) also appears to have a greater tendency toward underestimation [e.g., Roy and Boschetti, 2009]. This is probably because of the relatively coarse resolutions at which they are observed, causing nondetection of smaller or less intense fires and smaller burned areas [e.g., Wang et al., 2009; Tsala et al., 2014]. Since FRP and BA are the satellite-retrieved variables that are most commonly used for emissions estimates as in equations (14.2) and (14.3), the implications of their uncertainties for emissions require evaluation. Part of the reason why FRP and BA can be severely underestimated is because of the imaging geometry constraints of most satellite sensors, whereby pixels become large, fewer, and sometimes overlap away from nadir, resulting in lower total FRP, as illustrated in Figure 14.1. Similarly, BA has the tendency toward underestimation, whether it is derived using a change detection approach [e.g., Roy et al., 2008] or estimated from the active fire-pixel counts [e.g., Giglio et al., 2009]. A global assessment of the overall effect of this phenomenon based on a long record (2003–2009) of MODIS active fire observations in relation to scan angles is illustrated in Figure 14.2. By comparing fires observed at a single pixel at different off-nadir scan angles (starting from 25° up to the MODIS maximum of 55°) to the corresponding nadir pixel counts for the same fire, it has been found that a single fire pixel observed by MODIS at 55° off nadir can be equivalent to up to 16 fire pixels observed at nadir. In terms of FRP, although the value can be doubled at 55° off nadir, it becomes less than 30% when evaluated per km², which amounts to a net underestimation, since there are considerably fewer observations off nadir than at nadir.

To evaluate the uncertainty of aerosol emission estimates on model simulations, FEERv1 aerosol emissions were implemented in WRF-Chem over the NSSA region. Recent results of comparisons between FEERv1 aerosol emissions against other major emissions inventories in this region show that FEERv1 emissions are higher (by up to a factor of two) than many of the commonly used global fire emissions inventories that are based on bottom-up approaches [Ichoku and Ellison, 2014; Zhang et al., 2014]. Those bottom-up emissions inventories are typically used with enhancement factors in model simulations of smoke aerosols to match observed atmospheric aerosol distributions [e.g., Kaiser et al., 2012]. However, even when provided with uniform emissions, different models also have intrinsic characteristics that can significantly affect the uncertainty of simulations of smoke aerosol processes, transport, and impacts [e.g., Textor et al., 2007]. The quantitative evaluation performed in this study involves deriving aerosol optical depth (AOD...
### Table 14.2 The Uncertainty Ranges of Satellite-Derived Fire and Smoke Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item no.</th>
<th>Essential questions</th>
<th>Satellite retrieved variable</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Spatial resolution</th>
<th>Uncertainty levels*</th>
<th>Satellite sensors**</th>
<th>QuickBird, Ikonos</th>
<th>Landsat, ASTER, SPOT, (Lidar/SAR)*</th>
<th>MODISa</th>
<th>VIIRS, BIRD, TET-1, CALIP</th>
<th>MODISb MISR, AVHRR, SPOT-VGT, GOES, SEVIRI</th>
<th>MOPITT, AIRS, TES, SCIA, GOSAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fire location</td>
<td>Fire location</td>
<td>FLb</td>
<td>Very high (0.001–0.01 km)</td>
<td>±50%</td>
<td>~0.15 km</td>
<td>~0.75 km</td>
<td>~5 km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fuel load and</td>
<td>Biomass</td>
<td>BMc</td>
<td>High (0.01–0.1 km)</td>
<td>±50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65–250%</td>
<td>±50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fire size/intensity</td>
<td>Fire Area</td>
<td>FAd</td>
<td>Medium (0.1–1 km)</td>
<td>±30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±100 K</td>
<td>±50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fire Temp</td>
<td>FTs</td>
<td>Coarse (1–10 km)</td>
<td>±30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±30%</td>
<td>±50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fire Radiative Power</td>
<td>FRPf</td>
<td>Very coarse (10–100 km)</td>
<td>±0.5 km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.5 km</td>
<td>±7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fire characteristics</td>
<td>Flaming ratio</td>
<td>FSRg</td>
<td>Uncertainty range in % about the mean estimates</td>
<td>40%–140%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fire duration</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Burned area</td>
<td>±10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±20%</td>
<td>±30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Burned area</td>
<td>Burned area</td>
<td>BAh</td>
<td>Burn Severity</td>
<td>±70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Smoke emission rate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plume top height</td>
<td>±70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.5 km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Plume injection</td>
<td>Plume top height</td>
<td>PTHl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>height</td>
<td>Plume vertical profile</td>
<td>PVPm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Major smoke</td>
<td>Aerosol Optical Depth</td>
<td>AODj</td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>97%–102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>constituents</td>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
<td>COm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96%–102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carbon Dioxide</td>
<td>CO2n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Methane</td>
<td>CH4o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Uncertainty levels are expressed in measurement units or percentages. In the case of the latter, the measured value is subject to a source of relative error expressed in units or percentages (e.g., 50% or ±50%). Examples of the source of relative error include measurement precision, instrument accuracy, or the inherent variability in the natural phenomenon (e.g., area, mass, concentration, intensity).

** Satellite sensors: RapidEye, Ikonos, Landsat, ASTER, SPOT, (Lidar/SAR), MODIS, VIIRS, BIRD, TET-1, CALIP, MODISb MISR, AVHRR, SPOT-VGT, GOES, SEVIRI, MOPITT, AIRS, TES, SCIA, GOSAT.

b Location uncertainty depends on spatial resolution and observation geometry. These are expressed here as approximately half the typical average nominal pixel size in each resolution group.

c Biomass (BM) is used as a generic designation for fuel load. Airborne radar shows potential for spaceborne radar.

d Uncertainty range in % about the mean estimates.

e Uncertainty range in % about the mean estimates or in actual temperature (K) values.

f FRP is retrieved from satellite, but what is really needed is subpixel fire intensity.

g See [Lorenz et al., 2013].

h See [Loboda et al., 2007], [Giglio et al., 2009], [Roy and Boschetti, 2009], [Tsela et al., 2010, 2014], [Stroppiana et al., 2012], [Padilla et al., 2014].

i BS is typically expressed in the form of differenced Normalized Burn Ratio (dNBR) or Relative dNBR (RdNBR).

j See [Scollo et al., 2012].

k Because of its curtain character, CALIOP seldom scans near smoke plume source, which is where it is most needed to characterize plume injection.

l AOD is retrieved from satellite, but what is really needed is particulate matter (PM) concentrations in smoke. Typical range of AOD values is 0–5 (unitless).

m See [Kasibhatla et al., 2002], [Kopacz, 2010].

n What is actually evaluated is dry air column-averaged mole fractions of CO2 (XCO2).

o See [Schneising et al., 2009], [Morino et al., 2011], [Reuter et al., 2011].

p See [Schneising et al., 2009], [Morino et al., 2011].
| Item no | Essential questions | Satellite retrieved variable | Symbol | Satellite sensors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Smoke transformation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fire behavior</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fire diurnal/seasonal cycles</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Uncertainty levels are expressed in measurement units or percentages. In the case of the latter, the measured value is 100%, such that the range shows average uncertainty range.

** These are only selected currently or recently orbiting satellite sensors that are relevant to this study, and the details and relevant reference for each are given in Table 14.1.

* MODIS currently offers spatial resolutions of: 0.5 km for BA, 1 km for FL and FRP, and 3–10 km for AOD.

* Location uncertainty depends on spatial resolution and observation geometry. These are expressed here as approximately half the typical average nominal pixel size in each resolution group. See Zhukov et al. [2006], Hyer and Reid [2009], Csiszar et al. [2014], Schroeder et al. [2014a,b].

* Biomass (BM) is used as a generic designation for fuel load. Airborne radar shows potential for spaceborne radar. See Brands and Jacobson [2003], Jin et al. [2012].

* Uncertainty range in % about the mean estimates. See Lorenz et al. [2013], Peterson et al. [2013], Peterson and Wang [2013], Giglio and Kendall [2001].

* Uncertainty range in % about the mean estimates or in actual temperature (K) values. See Lorenz et al. [2013], Giglio and Kendall [2001].

* FRP is retrieved from satellite, but what is really needed is subpixel fire intensity. See Kaufman et al. [1998], Wooster [2003], Zhukov et al. [2006], Roberts and Wooster [2008, 2014], Peterson et al. [2013], Peterson and Wang [2013].

* See Lorenz et al. [2013].

* See Loboda et al. [2007], Giglio et al. [2009], Roy and Boschetti [2009], Tseli et al. [2010, 2014], Stroppiana et al. [2012], Padilla et al. [2014].

* BS is typically expressed in the form of differenced Normalized Burn Ratio (dNBR) or Relative dNBR (RdNBR); See Eising et al. [2005], Miller and Thode [2007].

* See Scollo et al. [2012].

* Because of its curtain character, CALIOP seldom scans near smoke plume source, which is where it is most needed to characterize plume injection. See Winker et al. [2009, 2013], Kacenelenbogen et al. [2014].

* AOD is retrieved from satellite, but what is really needed is particulate matter (PM) concentrations in smoke. Typical range of AOD values is 0–5 (unitless). See Petrenko and Ichoku [2013].

* See Kasibhatla et al. [2002], Kopacz [2010].

* What is actually evaluated is dry air column-averaged mole fractions of CO2 (XCO2). See Schneising et al. [2008], Morino et al. [2011], Reuter et al. [2011].

* See Schneising et al. [2009], Morino et al. [2011].

N/A = parameters that are currently not directly retrieved from satellite measurements.
from WRF-Chem based on FEERv1 emissions and comparing this with direct AOD retrievals from MODIS. This is done for January and February 2010, which is the typical peak of the burning season in NSSA. Incidentally, significant dust emissions also occur in this region during this season, as indicated by very heavy aerosol loading that appears prominently in dark red colors in Figure 14.3b, which represents a simple combination of both Terra- and Aqua-MODIS Collection 5 (C5) AOD retrievals from the Dark Target, Deep Blue, and Ocean algorithms. Although the current MODIS Collection 6 (C6) AOD product has a combined version [e.g., Levy et al., 2013], C5 is used for the current comparison to avoid an attempt to characterize additional discrepancy due to version differences, as the FEERv1 emissions were based on C5. Since WRF-Chem simulations did not include dust emissions, to avoid (or at least limit) dust influence in the satellite AOD samples, it was decided that these comparisons would be most realistic at areas that are not in the normal seasonal dust trajectory. Four areas were selected for the MODIS/WRF-Chem AOD comparisons and labeled according to the main country or region covered, namely: Senegal, Gabon, Central Africa, and Southern Sudan (Figs. 14.3b and 14.3c). Terra- and Aqua-MODIS C5 AOD are in general good agreement overall, but WRF-Chem AOD simulations are very low (Fig. 14.3d), in spite of the fact that the FEERv1 emissions upon which they are based are higher than those of most other existing smoke emissions inventories. This AOD underestimation may be due to a combination of multiple factors, one of which may be emissions underestimation, while others may include WRF-Chem model variables and parameters as well as assumptions and process treatment algorithms. Also, although the main areas

Figure 14.1 Effect of scan angle on MODIS observation of the Station Fire in Pasadena, California, on 30 August 2009. Fire detections near nadir (bottom left) show pixels to be almost square shaped at 1 × 1 km resolution, whereas near scan edge (bottom right) pixels are much fewer, individually stretched almost up to 4 × 2.5 km resolution, duplicated, and overlapping one another, and total FRP is underestimated.
of dust loading have been avoided in these comparisons, there could still be some residual dust or even cloud contamination in the MODIS-retrieved AOD. Because of various types of AOD retrieval constraints and MODIS swath coverage limitations, typical maps of AOD contain significant data gaps, such that the boxes for the regions of interest are seldom completely filled, as exemplified by Figure 14.3b, unlike Figure 14.3c, which shows complete coverage offered by the model. In Figure 14.3d, different circle symbol sizes on the Terra and Aqua curves depict the degree of coverage of sample areas for the MODIS AOD curves. The plots show that WRF-Chem AOD tends to agree better when the sample boxes have higher coverage by MODIS retrievals, as the root mean square error (RMSE) values denote in Table 14.3. Based on these results, it can be inferred that WRF-Chem regional modeling of smoke aerosols over NSSA using the FEERv1 satellite-based emissions estimates produce a net underestimation of AOD relative to satellite AOD, with the discrepancy becoming larger as the gap in satellite AOD coverage increases.

14.4. CONCLUSIONS

Satellite fire observation is relied upon for many applications. However, significant uncertainty is incurred in the satellite retrieval or estimation of biomass burning quantities, such as active fire location, area, temperature, radiative power, burned area and burn severity, plume injection and profile, and smoke constituents including aerosols and trace gases. Typically, the uncertainties tend to increase as the spatial and temporal resolutions of the
Figure 14.3 Evaluation of uncertainty in aerosol optical depth (AOD) generated from WRF-Chem model based on FEERv1 aerosol emissions, by comparison to satellite-observed AOD over northern sub-Saharan Africa (NSSA) during January–February 2010: (a) Fire locations and associated FRP values from MODIS on Terra and Aqua; (b) composited Terra and Aqua MODIS mean AOD for 5 February 2010, showing boxes where AOD comparisons are made; (c) WRF-Chem simulation of only smoke aerosol AOD for 5 February 2010, also showing the sampling box locations. AOD values increase from blue to red. Notice the difference in AOD value ranges as indicated by the color scales between (b) and (c). Boxed areas are selected to avoid the main dust trajectory (as indicated by the dark-red thick aerosol plume in [b]), such that the sampled AOD may be mainly smoke aerosols; (d) daily MODIS average AOD at Terra and Aqua overpass times (colored curves) and corresponding WRF-Chem simulations (black curves) for 12–1 p.m. local time, which coincides approximately with the average of the local times of Terra and Aqua overpasses. The size of the circles on the satellite-AOD curves indicate the extent of spatial coverage of the satellite retrievals within the sample boxes, as gaps do occur due to cloud or other factors that can cause AOD retrieval to fail (as seen in [b]).
satellite observations decrease. Incidentally, most of these biomass-burning quantities are currently observed at suboptimal spatial and temporal resolutions. For instance, the current operational systems, such as MODIS and VIIRS, that provide the most commonly used active fire products, observe these fires at nominal 1000 m and dual (375 m and 750 m) spatial resolutions, respectively, even though most open fires exist at much smaller scales. As a result, most of these fires are omitted and the FRP for those that are observed are mostly underestimated. In the same way, burned areas are underestimated. Since FRP and burned areas are used mostly to estimate smoke emissions, these also become underestimated and are propagated into modeling simulations of smoke distributions from fires.

Although such uncertainties affect fire measurements and modeling everywhere, the northern sub-Saharan African (NSSA) region has been used as a case study to evaluate the effect of emissions uncertainty on aerosol estimates for this study. This is fitting, given that NSSA contributes 20%–25% of global biomass burning, and together with southern sub-Saharan Africa (SSSA) make up >50% of the annual global biomass burning. Nevertheless, NSSA biomass burning has been one of the least investigated by means of ground-based or airborne measurement techniques, and therefore potentially harbors the largest uncertainty, as estimates of its biomass burning parameters are based mainly on satellite observations and other proxy information. Overall, it is found that FEERv1 emissions, which are based on a top-down approach from MODIS measurements of FRP and AOD, when used in regional smoke modeling with the WRF-Chem model can underestimate AOD relative to MODIS by 0.13 to 0.27 RMSE in AOD when MODIS has AOD retrievals in 50% or more of the area of interest. Paradoxically, a similar comparison of MODIS C5 AOD against simulated AOD from the Goddard Chemistry Aerosol Radiation and Transport (GOCART) global model using emissions based on satellite BA products through a variety of bottom-up approaches show a severe overestimation in the NSSA region [Petrenko et al., 2012]. This is even more surprising because those bottom-up emissions based on BA had been shown to produce lower smoke emissions than FEERv1, which is based on a top-down approach using FRP measurements [Ichoku and Ellison, 2014]. This type of obvious discrepancy causes a general confusion regarding which of the following three areas could be the main source of the uncertainty: emissions, model, or geographic region.

Uncertainties in the quantification of fire output, particularly smoke, by satellite and modeling can be affected by a variety of factors, including: satellite measurement characteristics, parameter retrieval algorithms, contamination of desired variables by other undesired targets such as clouds, model assumptions and resolution, and the surface and atmospheric characteristics of the geographic region of study. There is need for a well-coordinated, comprehensive, and robust strategy to address such uncertainty. Based on the results of the current study and those cited here, the following three recommendations become appropriate: (1) Conduct integrated field experiments combining ground-based, airborne, and satellite measurements and linking them to modeling in a synergistic way [e.g., Schroeder et al., 2014a] to better characterize biomass burning energetics and emissions in a coherent manner. (2) Conduct such integrated field studies in the NSSA region, which contributes 20%–25% of global biomass burning emissions and even a larger proportion of atmospheric dust loading within the same season, making remote-sensing discrimination of dust and smoke almost impossible over land, and thus far investigated mainly over ocean [e.g., Kaufman et al., 2005; Guo et al., 2013]. (3) Design future fire-related satellite missions with specific attention toward significantly improving the spatial, temporal, spectral, and radiometric resolutions of sensors to maximize the retrieval of the various variables related to fires and smoke, as listed in Table 14.2, in order to optimally address their associated essential questions.

Table 14.3 Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) Values Between WRF-Chem AOD Simulations and MODIS AOD Retrievals for Terra and Aqua According to Bins of 25% Coverage of MODIS AOD Retrievals Over Each Sample Box Area Shown in Figure 14.3b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box coverage (cov.)</th>
<th>Senegal</th>
<th>Gabon</th>
<th>C. Africa</th>
<th>S. Sudan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terra</td>
<td>Aqua</td>
<td>Terra</td>
<td>Aqua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% &lt; cov. &lt;100%</td>
<td>– (0)</td>
<td>0.22 (16)</td>
<td>– (0)</td>
<td>0.13 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% &lt; cov. &lt;75%</td>
<td>0.17 (27)</td>
<td>0.20 (20)</td>
<td>0.27 (1)</td>
<td>0.24 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% &lt; cov. &lt;50%</td>
<td>0.18 (25)</td>
<td>0.25 (17)</td>
<td>0.39 (11)</td>
<td>0.47 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% &lt; cov. &lt;25%</td>
<td>0.13 (7)</td>
<td>0.24 (6)</td>
<td>0.53 (47)</td>
<td>0.49 (56)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The numbers in parentheses represent the sample size (i.e., the number of days in January–February 2010 falling within the respective coverage bins for each case).
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