

SMAP Detects Soil Moisture under Temperate Forest Canopies

Andreas Colliander¹, Michael H. Cosh², Vicky R. Kelly³, Simon Kraatz⁴, Laura Bourgeau-Chavez⁵, Paul Siqueira⁴, Alexandre Roy⁶, Alexandra G. Konings⁷, Natan Holtzman⁷, Sidharth Misra¹, Dara Entekhabi⁹, Peggy O'Neill¹⁰, Simon H. Yueh¹

¹Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, USA

²USDA ARS Hydrology and Remote Sensing Laboratory, Beltsville, MD, USA

³Cary Institute of Ecosystem Studies, Millbrook, NY, USA

⁴University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, MA, USA

⁵Michigan Tech Research Institute, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

⁶Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières, Québec, Canada

⁷Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

⁹Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA

¹⁰NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD, USA

Corresponding author: Andreas Colliander (andreas.colliander@jpl.nasa.gov)

Key Points:

- Soil moisture monitoring networks deployed at two forested sites for SMAP validation experiment
- SMAP brightness temperature was used to retrieve soil moisture over predominantly forested sites
- The study demonstrates the capability of spaceborne L-band radiometry to retrieve soil moisture under forest canopies

Abstract

Soil moisture dynamics in the presence of dense vegetation canopies are determinants of ecosystem function and biogeochemical cycles, but the capability of existing spaceborne sensors to support reliable and useful estimates is not known. New results from a recently initiated field experiment in the northeast United States show that the NASA SMAP (Soil Moisture Active Passive) satellite is capable of retrieving soil moisture under temperate forest canopies. We present an analysis demonstrating that a parameterized emission model with the SMAP morning overpass brightness temperature resulted in a RMSD (root mean square difference) range of 0.047-0.057 m³/m³ and a Pearson correlation range of 0.75-0.85 depending on the experiment location and the SMAP polarization. The inversion approach included a minimal amount of ancillary data. This result demonstrates unequivocally that spaceborne L-band radiometry is sensitive to soil moisture under temperate forest canopies, which has been uncertain because of lack of representative reference data.

1 Introduction

During times of low soil moisture availability, trees experience water stress whereby their ability to maintain hydraulic integrity and continue physiological function becomes limited (Choat et al., 2012; Corlett et al., 2016; Doughty et al., 2015). Mapping the available water in the soils of these ecosystems is restricted by the effects of the canopy that stands between the remote sensing instrument and the forest floor. Remote sensing of soil moisture in forested areas has been an elusive goal since the start of microwave remote sensing, while for non-forested areas soil moisture data is being provided routinely (e.g., Kerr et al., 2016; Chan et al, 2018; 2016; Dorigo

et al., 2017; Das et al., 2019). Radiation emission and reflection from the soil surface in the lower frequency range of the microwave region of the spectrum are less likely than higher frequencies (including optical) to lose usefulness for tracking soil moisture dynamics in the presence of attenuation and scattering by vegetation. Specifically, radiometer observations at L-band (within the 1-2 GHz band, a small sub-band centered at 1.413 GHz is reserved for space and Earth science) have long been considered to be more suitable for soil moisture detection than higher frequencies (Schmugge et al., 1986). Forests represent the extreme of vegetation density where the low frequency is considered to be critical for a potential soil moisture detection. In the past, a number of studies in fully or partially forested conditions included tower-based (e.g., Guglielmetti et al., 2008; Kurum et al., 2012) and airborne (e.g., Lang et al, 2001; Macelloni et al., 2001; McNairn et al., 2015; Seppanen et al., 2016) measurements with L-band radiometers. These studies showed mixed results for soil moisture sensitivity.

ESA (European Space Agency) launched a satellite carrying an L-band radiometer in 2009 called Soil Moisture Ocean Salinity (SMOS) (Mecklenburg et al., 2016) and NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration) in 2015 called Soil Moisture Active Passive (SMAP) (Entekhabi et al., 2010). These missions opened the door for wide scale retrieving of soil moisture in forested area from space (e.g., Djamai et al., 2015; Vittucci et al., 2016; Kang et al., 2016; 2019; Monsavais-Huertero et al., 2019). However, the lack of appropriate reference soil moisture sources has been a major obstacle for quantifying, developing, testing and validating soil moisture retrieval algorithms from satellite observations (e.g., Vittucci et al., 2019).

Across non-forested or sparsely forested pixels, the performance of the SMAP radiometer-based soil moisture products meet the mission requirements as the requirements apply to conditions

where the vegetation water content is less than typical forested areas (up to 5 kg/m²) (Chan et al., 2016; 2018). The prevailing view is that above this level of canopy water content, the attenuation and scattering of surface emission by the vegetation are too strong to allow reliable inference about soil moisture. As the mission moved to the extended phase in June 2018, one of its objectives was to expand the domain of validated retrievals to forested areas. As the core sites used to validate the SMAP soil moisture retrieval performance did not include appropriate locations in forested environments (Colliander et al, 2017a), the mission decided to conduct field experiments in forested regions. The first experiment, called SMAP Validation Experiment 2019-2021 (SMAPVEX19-21), started in 2019 in two locations in the northeastern US and will continue through 2021. The experiment follows a series of SMAP post-launch validation experiments conducted in biomes with predominantly lower vegetation water content (e.g., Colliander et al., 2017b; 2019). The objective of the experiment is to test the SMAP retrieval in both fully forested and partially forested areas because a substantial portion of the US and the globe have a non-uniform forest cover at the SMAP resolution scale.

In this study, we present an analysis using the first-year station measurements of SMAPVEX19-21. Our hypothesis is that with a correctly parameterized emission model it is possible to retrieve soil moisture for the experiment domains. The parameterization of the low-frequency microwave emission from forests requires accounting for vegetation scattering in addition to vegetation attenuation and surface roughness. Several electromagnetic models have been presented in the past for accounting for the vegetation effect on the soil emission. The weakness of the widely used tau-omega model is that it assumes a low scattering for the vegetation in its formulation (Mo et al., 1982); this weakness has been addressed in many studies and alternative approaches

have been presented (e.g., Ferrazzoli et al., 2002; Kurum et al., 2011; Schwank et al., 2018). The SMAP single channel algorithm (SCA) also uses the tau-omega model for vegetation compensation (O'Neill et al., 2019a). Here, we used one of the alternative models presented in Colliander et al. (2018) that do not approximate the scattering contribution. The model has essentially the same parameters as the tau-omega model and in the absence of vegetation scattering it produces identical results to the tau-omega model. We compare the retrieval results using the parameterized model with the station-measured values to investigate whether SMAP is sensitive to soil moisture at the forested experiment sites.

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 SMAPVEX19-21 Sites

The mission chose two locations for SMAPVEX19-21, each encompassing an area corresponding to the retrieval domain of the SMAP enhanced soil moisture product (about 33 km). Figure 1 (a) shows the locations of the experiment sites in central Massachusetts and the Hudson Valley of New York. The Massachusetts (MA) site is 84% forested incorporating the Harvard Forest research site (<https://harvardforest.fas.harvard.edu/>) within its boundaries. The SMAP grid cell for MA has a dominance of beech-maple (ca. 46%) followed by pine forest (ca. 24%) and oak-hickory (ca. 12%) based on the National Land Cover Database (NLCD). The grid cell also has about 13% wetlands (ca. 12% forested, ca. 1% herbaceous) and only about 4% grassland/hay fields.

A permanent monitoring network of six soil moisture stations has been operating in upstate New York since 2015. The site is located near the village of Millbrook (MB) (Figure 1 (a)). The site is

about 36% non-forested, with about 23% of the total grid cell area mapped as pasture/hay fields by NLCD. Most of the forested station locations in the SMAP grid cell are oak-hickory (ca. 30%) or beech-maple (ca. 30%), with a few conifer forests (ca. 4%).

The forests in the experiment domains are representative of the northeastern temperate forests. The regional (about 150 km area around the experiment domains) mean biomass is about 130 t/ha with a standard deviation of 70 t/ha based on the US Forest Service Forest Inventory and Analysis data. The dominant species are Red and Sugar Maple, Red Oak, Eastern Hemlock and Eastern White Pine, and other typical species are White Ash, American Beech, Black Birch and Black Cherry based on the same data set. The biomass estimates and species composition found in local studies conducted at the experiment domains are mostly consistent with the regional characteristics. For example, Katz et al. (2010) show biomass values in the MB domain very close to the mean value of the region, while Ahmed et al. (2013) show that in the Harvard Forest area (which is not atypical in the MA domain) the biomass values may be on the high end of the regional values but within the range.

The experiment started by an installation of 23 and 25-station networks at the MA and MB sites in May 2019, respectively (Cosh et al., 2020a; 2020b). Figure 1 (b) and (c) show the locations of the stations. In order to accurately determine the average soil moisture within the experiment domains, a sufficient number of sampling locations are needed to account for the spatial variability. However, the spatial variability of soil moisture is not known exactly over the domains. Studies have presented relationships between soil moisture spatial variability and the required number of sampling locations (e.g., Famiglietti et al., 2008) as well as uncertainty estimates for spatial means based on the variability (Chen et al., 2019). Based on the typical

station numbers required in the previous studies (see also Crow et al, 2012), the number of sensors at each of the MA and MB sites should provide satisfactory accuracy for the average soil moisture estimate while respecting the logistical challenges for deploying the stations in forested landscapes.

The temporary network stations include soil moisture measurements with Stevens Water HydraProbe sensors at three different depths: one measuring a layer from the top down to about 6 cm depth, one measuring a layer at the depth of about 3-7 cm, and one a layer at the depth of about 8-12 cm. The first sensor is installed vertically top down, while the other two are installed horizontally. The soil moisture sensors at each depth also include a temperature sensor. Additionally, the stations include air temperature measurement at about 1.5 m height aboveground and a nadir pointing wildlife camera used for phenology monitoring. Some of the locations also include sap flow sensors and dielectric measurement of the tree trunks to enhance the vegetation monitoring (Matheny et al., 2015; Roy et al., 2020).

The factory calibration of the soil moisture sensors is not expected to provide unbiased soil moisture value because of the complex textural composition of the soil at the sites. The top layers of the soil are mixed with organic matter in different stages of decomposition. In this study, we used the measured real part of the dielectric constant (ϵ_r) as the reference. Two intensive observation periods planned for 2021 will include collection of soil core samples that will be used to eventually calibrate the soil moisture sensors using the thermo-gravimetric method (Dane and Topp, 2012). Before using the measurements, each sensor time-series was checked to be sure it did not have anomalous behavior (spikes, steps, drifting, etc.) or data gaps that would affect the mean value computed for the domains.




Figure 1. (a) Map of the experiment locations near Millbrook, New York (MB) and Amherst, Massachusetts (MA). (b) Locations of the temporary 25 soil moisture stations in the Millbrook pixel, and the locations of the six permanent stations (PNET) operated in the area. (c) Locations of the temporary 23 soil moisture stations (TNET) in the Massachusetts pixel. The background colors in (b) and (c) are based on the National Land Cover Database. The rectangles depict the SMAP pixel and the outlines of (b) and (c) are 50 km by 50 km.

2.2 SMAP Brightness Temperature Data

The L-band radiometer on-board the SMAP satellite includes vertically (V) and horizontally (H) polarized brightness temperature (TB) channels. The satellite has a sun-synchronous 6AM/6PM equator-crossing orbit, a constant 40° sensor incidence angle, and an approximately 1000-km swath width, which results in global coverage every 2-3 days (Entekhabi et al., 2014). The measurements have about 38 km resolution (defined by the half-power footprint on the Earth's surface of the radiometer antenna pattern) and the radiometric resolution of the gridded SMAP TB is less than 0.5 K (Piepmeier et al., 2017). The SMAP enhanced TB and soil moisture products grid the values on a 9-km EASE ver. 2 grid (Chaubell et al., 2019; O'Neill et al., 2019b). However, as the actual footprint of the measurement is considerably larger than the grid size, the retrieval domain for the enhanced soil moisture product was chosen to be about 33 km

(Chan et al., 2018). The actual size is determined based on 11 by 11 cells of the SMAP 3-km grid, which is nested with the 9-km grid. Thus, the domains are not exactly square, but follow the shape of the EASE ver. 2 grid used for SMAP (see Figure 1). The analysis presented here excluded the TB measurements flagged for radio frequency interference contamination (Piepmeier et al., 2014; Mohammed et al., 2016). The SMAP satellite experienced a data outage from June 20 to July 22, 2019 resulting in no retrievals during this period.

2.3 Forward Model

In order to model the forest emission, we applied a two-layer model introduced in Colliander et al. (2018). The model represents propagation of emission in the soil-vegetation-air medium with vegetation transmission (t_p ; p stands for polarization, V or H) and scattering (S_p) parameters. The top of the vegetation TB is formulated as follows:

$$T_{Bp} = (1 - r_p)T_{soil} \left(\frac{t_p}{1 + S_p r_p} \right) + \left(1 - \frac{t_p}{1 - S_p} \right) T_{veg} + \left(1 - \frac{t_p}{1 - S_p} \right) T_{veg} \frac{t_p r_p}{1 + S_p r_p} \quad (1)$$

where T_{soil} is the effective temperature of the soil and T_{veg} is the effective temperature of the vegetation layer. Effective temperatures corresponds to the average temperature of the parts of the medium emitting the radiation (see, e.g., Njoku and Kong, 1977). The transmission, t_p , parameter is related to the vegetation optical (electromagnetic) depth parameter τ_p as:

$$t_p = e^{-\tau_p} \quad (2)$$

The scattering parameter (S_p) is related to the radiative transfer scattering coefficient (κ_{sp}) as

$$S_p = 1 - e^{-\kappa_{sp}} \quad (3)$$

Thus, the scattering albedo can be solved as $\omega_p = \kappa_{sp}/\tau_p$. It is noted that for the τ - ω model the τ and ω parameters are not exactly the same as defined in standard radiative transfer modeling although they serve a similar purpose (Mo et al., 1982). Finally, the vegetation absorption (a_p) is given by the $1 - t_p/(1 - S_p)$ component in (1). According to Kirchhoff's law, the absorption determines the emission by the vegetation. The three terms on the right-hand side of (1) represent from left to right: the soil emission through vegetation, vegetation emission, and vegetation emission reflected from the ground and propagated up through the vegetation, respectively.

We modeled the rough surface reflectivity (r_p) with an adaptation of the classical Choudhury roughness model (Choudhury et al., 1979), which with constant incidence angle reduces to a simple multiplicative factor (H_{0p}) on the Fresnel flat surface reflectivity (r_{0p}):

$$r_p = r_{0p}H_{0p} = r_{0p}e^{-H_p} = r_{0p}e^{-h_p\cos^2(\theta)} \quad (4)$$

where h_p is the original roughness parameter in the Choudhury model; H_p represents a normalized roughness parameter used later to compare the parameterization to literature values, and θ stands for incidence angle. We do not assume polarization mixing in the rough surface ($Q=0$). The flat surface reflectivity is related to the ε_r of the soil through the Fresnel equations (e.g., Njoku et al., 1996).

We transformed both the retrieved ε_r and the measured ε_r to soil moisture using the Mironov dielectric model (Mironov et al., 2009) in order to assess the results in the soil moisture scale. The use of the same model for the measured ε_r and the retrieved ε_r eliminates the additional uncertainty of potentially inaccurate and divergent dielectric models applied to the in situ sensors and the retrievals.

2.4 Parameter Optimization Approach

Our goal was to find a set of model parameters for predicting soil moisture from the SMAP measurements. Relatively little is known about the surface and vegetation parameterization at the global scale; in particular, for forests. The underrepresentation of the forested field campaigns in the past have led most retrieval algorithms to assume a set of values that is globally uniform or dependent on the land cover classification schemes that do not necessarily correspond to the real variability of these parameters. Similarly, because little is known of what T_{veg} should be, most algorithms assume the same value for T_{soil} and T_{veg} (and focus on retrieval times when the diurnally variable vertical temperature gradient is assumed to be smallest), but in taller and denser canopies, such as forests, this assumption is more likely to break down. The local optimization of the parameters will help us to answer the question of whether SMAP retrievals are possible, but does not automatically translate to globally applicable parameters.

Essential for testing SMAP's skill to detect soil moisture changes is an adequate range of soil moisture during the test period. The first-year measurements of SMAPVEX19-21 provide a 0.35 m^3/m^3 range at the MA pixel and a 0.39 m^3/m^3 range at the MB pixel, which satisfies this requirement. For computing the reference soil ϵ_r , we averaged the measurements from the vertically installed sensors representing the spatial domain (see Section 2.1). We inverted the forward model and simulated soil ϵ_r for the measured SMAP TB with different model parameter values. Thus, for each parameter combination, we had a set of inverted ϵ_r values corresponding to the measured TB, which we compared with respect to the station-measured ϵ_r . Moreover, we extended the optimization process to include the selection of temperature measurements for T_{soil}

and T_{veg} . Each parameter combination was computed with different permutations of the measured temperatures as follows: T_{soil} was one of the temperatures measured by the soil moisture sensors, and T_{veg} was one of the temperatures measured by the soil moisture sensors or the air temperature.

We computed the RMSD (root mean square difference), mean difference (MD), and slope between the set of inverted and measured ε_r for each case with different parameter values and temperature selections. Each parameter was swept over a range of values and the metrics were computed for each case. Because it is possible to achieve the best RMSD with poor MD and/or slope, we set a limit for the MD and the slope; then picked the parameter values corresponding to the minimum RMSD within this subset. We executed this process separately for V and H polarization and the two experiment domains resulting in optimized H_p , t_p and S_p parameters as well as a choice of temperature source for T_{soil} and T_{veg} for both domains. There is no reason to assume major seasonality for H_p . The t_p parameter may vary as a result of the water content changes in the trees over the season, especially as the domains are dominated by deciduous species, which may also affect S_p . The multi-year data set will provide a more robust basis for investigation of the seasonality of these parameters; here we focused on demonstrating the sensitivity to soil moisture variability.

3 Results

We performed the parameter optimization approach described in Section 2.4 for the MA and MB domain. The slope limits for the parameter search were 1 ± 0.1 and the bias limits were ± 1 in ε_r . There was a fair amount of variability in the results, but we also observed that some cases with

different combinations of the parameters resulted in relatively similar results. The results were also reasonably similar when we separated the SMAP morning (AM) and evening (PM) overpasses. Therefore, after some iteration we fixed the roughness parameter for V and H polarization and the choice of temperature measurement (see below) as we noticed that we could achieve essentially the same performance, but with more consistent parameterization across different cases. This helps the interpretation of the results. For the parameter search, we combined the AM and PM overpasses, but computed the eventual metrics separately for the two cases.

Figure 2 shows the scatter-plots in soil moisture for the retrievals over each domain using the SMAP vertically and horizontally polarized TB for AM and PM overpasses separately. The outliers marked with circle correspond to mostly PM overpass measurements very early in the season before leaf flush (Figure S1 shows the time-series of the measurements and retrievals and indicates also the timing of the outliers). We decided to remove these data points from the metrics computation because the conditions between snowmelt and leaf-on require further investigation, which is better studied using the multi-year time series that will be eventually collected in the experiment. The RMSD ranges from 0.047 m³/m³ to 0.057 m³/m³ for the AM overpasses and from 0.046 m³/m³ to 0.055 m³/m³ for the PM overpasses; the Pearson correlation ranges from 0.75 to 0.85 for the AM overpasses and 0.64 to 0.82 for the PM overpasses. The correlation is somewhat higher for AM than for PM but otherwise the differences between AM and PM metrics are small. The bias is negligible because we purposefully eliminated it by limiting it to ± 1 in ε_r . For MB, the RMSD was higher for H polarization than for MA, but MB also had a larger range of soil moisture. Thus, despite the higher RMSD, MB had better

correlations than MA in all cases. The metrics demonstrate that the SMAP measurements are sensitive to soil moisture under forest canopy at a reasonable precision.

The surface roughness parameter H_{0p} for each case was 0.51 for V polarization and 0.43 for H-polarization, which translates to h_p of 1.15 and 1.44, respectively, and H_p of 0.67 and 0.84, respectively (see Table 1). These values are significantly higher than that used by the SMAP in its SCA (0.16; see Table 1) and at the high end of roughness values reported in the literature, but not exceptionally high. Table 2 in Colliander et al. (2016) showed H_p values reported in several studies that ranged from 0.06 to 0.9.

Table 1 shows the vegetation parameter values obtained in the search process. For the attenuation, the table shows the values for both the t_p and τ_p , and for the scattering for both S_p and ω_p . The transmissivity is lower and scattering is higher for the V polarization for both sites. This is expected because the vertical structures of the forest interfere with the V polarization more effectively than with the H polarization. The transmissivity is somewhat lower for the MA pixel than for the MB pixel, which is in line with fact that the MB pixel contains more non-forested areas. The scattering parameters are very similar for both domains, and notably, ω_p is nearly uniform across all cases. Correspondingly, the absorption is larger for MA. As absorption of the vegetation determines the emission by the vegetation, the values indicate that at 20°C temperature the vegetation TB contribution ($a_p \cdot T_{veg}$) would range from 40% to 55% of the total TB depending on the case. This result highlights the importance of compensating for the vegetation correctly with both transmission and scattering parameters using the right temperature. Table 1 also shows that the τ_p parameters are significantly lower and the ω_p

parameters are higher than those used in the SMAP SCA. The current SMAP SCA parameterization results in overestimation and reduced sensitivity to soil moisture through the large τ_p parameter value (see Figure S1).

The temperature measured by the 5-cm depth (horizontally installed) soil moisture sensors were used for T_{soil} and the temperature measured by the vertically installed soil moisture sensors were used for T_{veg} . There was some variability in the results for the optimal temperature between the vertical sensor and 5-cm sensor, but the utilization of the same choice of temperatures for each case did not affect the overall results markedly. The choice of the temperature sources optimizes the parameter search together with the other parameters; this result alone does not directly indicate that these particular choices for the measurements would correspond most accurately to the real effective temperature of the soil and vegetation. As a practical example, the vegetation emission is a product of the absorption and the effective temperature (see above); parameters leading to a lower absorption could be compensated with a higher temperature and vice versa.




Figure 2. Scatterplots of the retrieved and reference soil moistures using vertical (top row) and horizontal (bottom row) polarizations for MA (left-hand side) and MB (right-hand side) pixels. The metrics show RMSD [m^3/m^3], bias [m^3/m^3], unbiased RMSD (ubRMSD) [m^3/m^3], and correlation (R) [-] (P-values < 0.01). The black dots represent the morning overpasses (AM) and the red dots represent the evening overpasses (PM). The circled data points are the early season outliers, which are not included in the metrics.

312

313 *Table 1. The parameterization of the retrieval algorithm used to produce the results in Figure 2 and the parameter*
 314 *values used in the SMAP single channel algorithm (SCA) for the experiment locations (O'Neill et al., 2019).*

		Surface Roughness			Vegetation Attenuation		Vegetation Scattering		Vegetation Absorption	SMAP SCA Parameters		
Site	Pol	H_{0p}	h_p	H_p	t_p	τ_p	S_p	ω_p	a_p	h_p	τ_p	ω_p
MA	V	0.51	1.15	0.67	0.45	0.80	0.09	0.12	0.51	0.16	1.86	0.05
	H	0.43	1.44	0.84	0.59	0.53	0.05	0.10	0.38	0.16	1.86	0.05
MB	V	0.51	1.15	0.67	0.47	0.78	0.09	0.12	0.48	0.16	1.50	0.05
	H	0.43	1.44	0.84	0.61	0.49	0.06	0.12	0.35	0.16	1.50	0.05

315

316 4 Discussion and Conclusion

317 In this letter, we took the first step toward quantifiably defined soil moisture retrieval for forests
 318 using spaceborne L-band radiometry. We used the SMAP TB measurements to achieve results
 319 that affirm the capability to retrieve soil moisture under the full canopy of temperate forests. The
 320 study focused on showing that we could find a set of emission model parameters that retrieve soil
 321 moisture with a reasonable performance from TB and physical temperature measurements. The
 322 V polarization RMSD to the in situ measurements were $0.049 \text{ m}^3/\text{m}^3$ and $0.054 \text{ m}^3/\text{m}^3$ over the
 323 MA and MB sites and correlation 0.66 and 0.85, respectively; the corresponding metrics for the
 324 H polarization were $0.046 \text{ m}^3/\text{m}^3$ and $0.57 \text{ m}^3/\text{m}^3$ for RMSD and 0.64 and 0.83 for correlation.
 325 The differences between polarizations and overpass times were not substantial. Traditionally,
 326 this level of performance has been considered as a sign of successful soil moisture retrieval.

One of the significant findings of the study was the general level of transmissivity through the forest vegetation layer. While the attenuation by the forest is considerable, it is not enough to entirely suppress the soil moisture signal. The selection of the vegetation transmission and scattering parameters is critical as well as the use of a correct physical temperature for the estimation of the vegetation emission. Traditionally, AM overpasses have been favored for soil moisture retrieval because the temperature gradient between vegetation and soil tends to be smaller than later in the day (O'Neill et al., 2019). However, the air and soil temperature measurements recorded in the experiment exhibited a seasonal change in the timing and magnitude of the gradient: the gradient was smaller during the AM overpasses in the spring, but towards the late summer, the gradient was, in fact, smaller during the PM overpasses (Figure S2). This explains the relative similarity of the metrics computed for the AM and PM retrievals and suggests PM observations may be more useful for soil moisture retrieval (if vegetation canopy temperature can be correctly accounted for) than traditionally considered.

The flip side of the relatively large vegetation attenuation is that the TB measurements also carry a great amount of information on the vegetation properties. In the past studies, the vegetation transmission for L-band TB has been related to the vegetation water content (Kirdiashev et al., 1979; Jackson, et al., 1991). Recently, the vegetation optical depth in forests has been related to plant hydrology (Konings et al., 2019). This study supports this line of utilization of L-band TB measurements. However, the tuning process showed there are substantial differences between V and H polarizations. The commonly used algorithms for retrieving vegetation parameters assume the same transmission and scattering values for V and H (e.g., Njoku et al., 1999; Chan et al.,

2016; Konings et al., 2017; Chaubell et al., 2020). In light of this study, these algorithms may need to account for polarization differences for a better performance in the future.

This study focused on the first year station-based soil moisture measurements from SMAPVEX19-21 to demonstrate the sensitivity of the spaceborne L-band TB to soil moisture. Eventually, the experiment will provide a very rich data set on both soil and vegetation properties with a longer time-series that will enable more detailed investigations into both soil moisture and vegetation retrievals in temperate forest canopies.

Acknowledgments

This work was performed at Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology under a contract with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. We would like to thank Dr. Charles D. Canham for processing the US Forest Service Forest Inventory and Analysis data. NMH and AGK were supported by NASA Terrestrial Ecology award 80NSSC18K0715 through the New Investigator Program. USDA is an equal opportunity employer and provider. The SMAP data products (<https://doi.org/10.5067/017XZSKMLTT2>) and the station data (<https://doi.org/10.5067/3LXL78PSKVXQ> and <https://doi.org/10.5067/NXNJWN9933UI>) can be accessed through the National Snow and Ice Data Center (<https://nsidc.org>).

References

Ahmed, Razi; Siqueira, Paul; Hensley, Scott; Bergen, Kathleen. (2013). Uncertainty of Forest Biomass Estimates in North Temperate Forests Due to Allometry: Implications for Remote Sensing. Remote Sens., Vol. 5, No. 6, pp. 3007-3036.

368 Chan, S.K, R. Bindlish, P.E. O'Neill, E. Njoku, et al, "Assessment of the SMAP Passive Soil
 369 Moisture Product," IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens., Vol. 54, No. 8, pp. 4994-5007,
 370 2016.

371 Chan, S.K, R. Bindlish, P. O'Neill, T. Jackson, et al. (2018). Development and Assessment of
 372 the SMAP Enhanced Passive Soil Moisture Product. Remote Sens. Environ., Vol. 204,
 373 pp. 931-941.

374 Chaubell, J., S.H. Yueh, J. Peng, R.S. Dunbar, S.K. Chan, F. Chen, J.R. Piepmeier, R. Bindlish,
 375 D. Entekhabi, P.E. O'Neill. (2019). Improving Brightness Temperature Measurements
 376 Near Coastal Areas for SMAP. IEEE J. Sel. Topics Appl. Earth Obs. Remote Sens., Vol.
 377 12, No. 11, pp. 4578-4588.

378 Chaubell, M.J., S.H. Yueh, R.S. Dunbar, A. Colliander, F. Chen, S.K. Chan, D. Entekhabi, R.
 379 Bindlish, P.E. O'Neill, et al. (2020). Improved SMAP Dual-Channel Algorithm for the
 380 Retrieval of Soil Moisture. IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens., Vol. 58, No. 6, pp. 3894-
 381 3905.

382 Chen, F., W.T. Crow, M.H. Cosh, A. Colliander, J. Asanuma, A. Berg, D.D. Bosch, T.G.
 383 Caldwell, C. Holifield Collins, K. Høgh Jensen, J. Martínez-Fernández, H. McNairn, P.J.
 384 Starks, Z. Su, and J.P. Walker. (2019). Uncertainty of Reference Pixel Soil Moisture
 385 Averages Sampled at SMAP Core Validation Sites. J. Hydrometeorology, Vol. 20, pp.
 386 1553-1568.

387 Choat, B., S. Jansen, T.J. Brodribb, H. Cochard, S. Delzon, R. Bhaskar, S.J. Bucci, T.S. Feild,
388 S.M. Gleason, U.W. Hacke et al. (2012). Global Convergence in the Vulnerability of
389 Forests to Drought. *Nature*, Vol. 491, pp. 752-755. DOI: 10.1038/nature11688

390 Colliander, A., E.G. Njoku, T.J. Jackson, S. Chazanoff, H. McNairn, J. Powers, M.H. Cosh.
391 (2016). Retrieving Soil Moisture for Non-Forested Areas using PALS Radiometer
392 Measurements in SMAPVEX12 Field Campaign. *Rem. Sens. Env.*, Vol. 184, pp. 86-100.

393 Colliander, A., T.J. Jackson, R. Bindlish, S. Chan, et al. (2017a). Validation of SMAP Surface
394 Soil Moisture Products with Core Validation Sites. *Rem. Sens. Env.*, Vol. 191, pp. 215-
395 231.

396 Colliander, A., M.H. Cosh, S. Misra, T.J. Jackson, W.T. Crow, S. Chan, R. Bindlish, C. Chae, C.
397 Holifield Collins, S.H. Yueh. (2017b). Validation and Scaling of Soil Moisture in a Semi-
398 Arid Environment: SMAP Validation Experiment 2015 (SMAPVEX15),” *Remote*
399 *Sensing of Environment*, 196, 101-112.

400 Colliander, A., E.G. Njoku, H. Huang, L. Tsang. (2018). Soil Moisture Retrieval using Full
401 Wave Simulations of 3-D Maxwell Equations for Compensating Vegetation Effects.
402 *Proc. IEEE Int. Geosci. Remote Sens. Symposium* 2018.

403 Colliander, A., M.H. Cosh, S. Misra, T.J. Jackson, W.T. Crow, J. Powers, H. McNairn, P.
404 Bullock, A. Berg. (2019). Comparison of High-Resolution Airborne Soil Moisture
405 Retrievals to SMAP Soil Moisture during the SMAP Validation Experiment 2016
406 (SMAPVEX16). *Remote Sens. Environ.*, Vol. 227, pp. 137-150.

407 Corlett, R.T. (2016). The Impacts of Droughts in Tropical Forests. Trends in Plant Science, Vol.
 408 21, No. 7, pp. 584-593. DOI: 10.1016/j.tplants.2016.02.003

409 Cosh, M., V. Kelly, and A. Colliander. (2020a). SMAPVEX19-21 Massachusetts Temporary
 410 Soil Moisture Network, Version 1. Boulder, Colorado USA. NASA National Snow and
 411 Ice Data Center Distributed Active Archive Center. DOI: 10.5067/3LXL78PSKVXQ

412 Cosh, M., V. Kelly, and A. Colliander. (2020b). SMAPVEX19-21 Millbrook Temporary Soil
 413 Moisture Network, Version 1. Boulder, Colorado USA. NASA National Snow and Ice
 414 Data Center Distributed Active Archive Center. DOI: 10.5067/NXNJWN9933UI

415 Crow, W.T., A.A. Berg, M.H. Cosh, A. Loew, B.P. Mohanty, R. Panciera, P. de Rosnay, D. Ryu,
 416 J.P. Walker. (2012). Upscaling Sparse Ground-Based Soil Moisture Observations for the
 417 Validation of Coarse-Resolution Satellite Soil Moisture Products. Review of Geophysics.
 418 Vol. 50. DOI: 10.1029/2011RG000372

419 Dane, J. H. & Topp G. C. (ed.) (2002). Methods of Soil Analysis Part 4 Physical Methods. Soil
 420 Science Society of America, Madison, WI, USA.

421 Das, N., D. Entekhabi, R.S. Dunbar, M.J. Chaubell, A. Colliander, S. Yueh, T. Jagdhuber, F.
 422 Chen, W. Crow, P.E. O'Neill, et al. (2019). Remote Sens. Environ., Vol. 223.

423 Djamai, N., R. Magagi, K. Goita, M. Hosseini, M.H. Cosh, A. Berg, B. Toth. (2015). Evaluation
 424 of SMOS soil moisture products over the CanEx-SM10 area. J. Hydrology, Vol. 520, pp.
 425 254-267, DOI: 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2014.11.026.

426 Dorigo, W., W. Wagner, C. Albergel, F. Albrecht, G. Balsamo, L. Brocca, D. Chung, M. Ertl, M.
 427 Forkel, A. Gruber. (2017). ESA CCI Soil Moisture for Improved Earth System

428 Understanding: State-of-the-Art and Future Directions. Remote Sens. Environ., Vol. 203,
429 pp. 185-215.

430 Doughty, C.E., D.B. Metcalfe, C.A.J. Girardinm F. Farfan Amezquita, D. Galiano Cabrera, W.
431 Huaraca Huasco, J.E. Silva-Espejo, et al. (2015). Drought Impact on Forest Carbon
432 Dynamics and Fluxes in Amazonia. Nature, Vol. 519, pp. 78-82. DOI:
433 10.1038/nature14213

434 Entekhabi, D., et al. (2010). The Soil Moisture Active Passive (SMAP) Mission. Proc. IEEE, vol.
435 98, no. 5, pp. 704-716.

436 Entekhabi, D., S. Yueh, P. O'Neill, and K. Kellogg. (2014). SMAP Handbook – Soil Moisture
437 Active Passive: Mapping Soil Moisture and Freeze/Thaw from Space. SMAP Project, Jet
438 Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, CA.

439 Famiglietti, J.S., D. Ryu, A. A. Berg, M. Rodell, T. J. Jackson, (2008). Field Observations of
440 Soil Moisture Variability across Scales,” Water Resources Research, Vol. 44, W01423.

441 Ferrazzoli, P., L. Guerriero, J-P. Wigneron. (2002). Simulating L-Band Emission of Forests in
442 View of Future Satellite Applications. IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens., Vol. 40, No.
443 12, pp. 2700-2708. DOI: 10.1109/TGRS.2002.807577

444 Guglielmetti, M., M. Schwank, C. Matzler, C. Oberdorster, J. Vanderborght, H. Fluhler. (2008).
445 FOSMEX: Forest Soil Moisture Experiments With Microwave Radiometry. IEEE Trans.
446 Geosci. Remote Sens., Vol. 46, No. 3.

447 Jackson, T.J., T.J. Schmugge. (1991). Vegetation Effects on the Microwave Emission of Soils.
448 Remote Sens. Environ., Vol. 36, pp. 203-212.

449 Kang, C.S., K.D. Kanniah, Y.H. Kerr, A.P. Cracknell. (2016). Analysis of in-situ soil moisture
450 data and validation of SMOS soil moisture products at selected agricultural sites over a
451 tropical region, *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, Vol. 37, No. 16, pp. 3636-3654,
452 DOI: 10.1080/01431161.2016.1201229

453 Kang, C. S., K. D. Kanniah and Y. H. Kerr. (2019). Calibration of SMOS Soil Moisture
454 Retrieval Algorithm: A Case of Tropical Site in Malaysia. *IEEE Transactions on*
455 *Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, Vol. 57, No. 6, pp. 3827-3839, DOI:
456 10.1109/TGRS.2018.2888535.

457 Katz, D.S.W., G.M. Lovett, C.D. Canham, C.M. O'Reilly. (2010). Legacies of Land Use History
458 Diminish Over 22 Years in a Forest in Southeastern New York. *J. Torrey Botanical*
459 *Society*, Vol. 137, No. 2-3, pp. 236-251.

460 Kerr, Y., A. Al-Yaari, N. Rodriguez-Fernandez, M. Parrens, B. Molero, D. Leroux, S. Bircher,
461 A. Mahmoodi, A. Mialon, P. Richaume, S. Delwart, et al. (2016). Overview of SMOS
462 Performance in Terms of Global Soil Moisture Monitoring after Six Years in Operation.
463 *Remote Sens. Environ.*, Vol. 180, pp. 40-63.

464 Kirdiashev, K.P., A.A. Chukhlantsev, A.M. Shutko. (1979). Microwave Radiation of the Earth's
465 Surface in the Presence of Vegetation Cover. *Radio Eng. Electron.*, Vol. 24, pp. 256-264.

466 Konings, A.G., M. Piles, N. Das, and D. Entekhabi. (2017). L-band vegetation optical depth and
467 effective scattering albedo estimation from SMAP. *Remote Sens. Environ.*, Vol. 198, pp.
468 460–470. doi: 10.1016/j.rse.2017.06.037.

469 Konings, A.G., K. Rao, S.C. Steele-Dunne. (2019). Macro to Micro: Microwave Remote Sensing
 470 of Plant Water Content for Physiology and Ecology. *New Phytologist*, Vol. 233, pp.
 471 1166-1172. doi: 10.1111/nph.15808

472 Kurum, M., R.H. Lang, P.E. O'Neill, A.T. Joseph, T.J. Jackson, M.H. Cosh. (2011). A First-
 473 Order Radiative Transfer Model for Microwave Radiometry of Forest Canopies at L-
 474 Band. *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, Vol. 49, No. 9, pp. 3167-3179.

475 Kurum, M., P.E. O'Neill, R.H. Lang, A.T. Joseph, M.H. Cosh, T.J. Jackson. (2012). Effective
 476 Tree Scattering and Opacity at L-band. *Remote Sens. Environ.*, Vol. 118, pp. 1-9.

477 Lang, R.H., C. Utku, P. de Mattheis, N. Chauhan, and D. M. LeVine. (2001). ESTAR and
 478 Model Brightness Temperatures over Forests: Effects of Soil Moisture. *Proc. IEEE Int.*
 479 *Geosci. Remote Sens. Symp.* 2001.

480 Macelloni, G., S. Paloscia, P. Pampaloni, R. Ruisi, and C. Susini (2001). Airborne
 481 Multifrequency L- to Ka-band Radiometric Measurements over Forests. *IEEE Trans.*
 482 *Geosci. Remote Sens.*, vol. 39, pp. 2507–2513.

483 Matheny, A.M., G. Bohrer, S.R. Garrity, T.H. Morin, C.J. Howard, C.S. Vogel. (2015).
 484 Observations of Stem Water Storage in Trees of Opposing Hydraulic Strategies.
 485 *Ecosphere*, Vol. 6, No. 9. DOI: 10.1890/ES15-00170.1

486 McNairn, H., T. Jackson, G. Wiseman, S. Belair, A. Berg, P. Bullock, A. Colliander, M. Cosh, S.
 487 Kim, R. Magagi, et al. (2015). The Soil Moisture Active Passive Validation Experiment
 488 2012 (SMAPVEX12): Pre-Launch Calibration and Validation of the SMAP Satellite.
 489 *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Rem. Sens.*, Vol. 53, No. 5.

490 Mecklenburg, S., M. Drusch, L. Kaleschke, N. Rodriguez-Fernandez, N. Reul, Y. Kerr, J. Font,
 491 M. Martin-Neira, R. Oliva, et al. (2016). ESA's Soil Moisture and Ocean Salinity
 492 mission: From Science to Operational Applications. *Remote Sens. Environ.*, Vol. 180, pp.
 493 3-18.

494 Mohammed, P.N., M. Aksoy, J.R. Piepmeier, J.T. Johnson, A. Bringer. (2016). SMAP L-Band
 495 Microwave Radiometer: RFI Mitigation Prelaunch Analysis and First Year On-Orbit
 496 Observations. *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, Vol. 54, No. 10, pp. 6035-6047.

497 Mo, T., B.J. Choudhury, T.J. Schmugge, J.R. Wang, T.J. Jackson. (1982). A Model for
 498 Microwave Emission From Vegetation Covered Fields. *J. Geophys. Res.*, Vol. 87, No.
 499 C13, pp. 11229-11237.

500 Monsiváis-Huertero, A., J.C. Hernández-Sánchez, J.C. Jiménez-Escalona, J. M. Galeana-Pizaña,
 501 D.E. Constantino-Recillas, A.C. Torres-Gómez, R. Magagi, K. Goïta, S. Couturier.
 502 (2020). Impact of Temporal Variations in Vegetation Optical Depth and Vegetation
 503 Temperature on L-band Passive Soil Moisture Retrievals over a Tropical Forest Using In-
 504 Situ Information. *Int. J. Remote Sens.*, Vol. 41, No. 6, pp. 2098-2139, DOI:
 505 10.1080/01431161.2019.1685715

506 Njoku, E.G, J.-A. Kong. (1977). Theory for Passive Microwave Remote Sensing of Near-Surface
 507 Soil Moisture. *J. Geophys. Res.*, Vol. 82, No. 20, pp. 3108-3118. DOI:
 508 10.1029/JB082i020p03108

509 Njoku E. G., and D. Entekhabi (1996). Passive Microwave Remote Sensing of Soil Moisture. *J.*
 510 *Hydrology*, Vol. 184, pp. 101-129.

511 Njoku, E.G., and L. Li. (1999). Retrieval of land surface parameters using passive microwave
512 measurements at 6–18 GHz. *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 79–
513 93.

514 O'Neill, P., S. Chan, E.G. Njoku, T.J. Jackson, R. Bindlish. (2019a). Algorithm Theoretical
515 Basis Document Level 2 & 3 Soil Moisture (Passive) Data Products, Rev. E. SMAP
516 Project, JPL D-66480, August 15, 2019. Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, CA.

517 O'Neill, P. E., S. Chan, E. G. Njoku, T. Jackson, R. Bindlish, and J. Chaubell. 2019. SMAP
518 Enhanced L2 Radiometer Half-Orbit 9 km EASE-Grid Soil Moisture, Version 3. Boulder,
519 Colorado USA. NASA National Snow and Ice Data Center Distributed Active Archive
520 Center. DOI: 10.5067/017XZSKMLTT2. [Date Accessed: June 23, 2020]

521 Piepmeier, J.R., J.T. Johnson, P.N. Mohammad, D. Bradley, C. Ruf, M. Aksoy, R. Garcia, D.
522 Hudson, L. Miles, M. Wong. (2014). Radio-Frequency Interference Mitigation for the
523 Soil Moisture Active Passive Microwave Radiometer. *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote*
524 *Sens.*, Vol. 52, No. 1, pp. 761-775.

525 Piepmeier, J.R., P. Focardi, K.A. Horgan, J. Knuble, N. Ehsan, J. Lucey, C. Brambora, et al.
526 (2017). SMAP L-Band Microwave Radiometer: Instrument Design and First Year on
527 Orbit. *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, Vol. 55, No. 4, pp. 1954-1966.

528 Roy, A., P. Toose, A. Mavrovic, C. Pappas, A. Royer, C. Derksen, A. Berg, T. Rowlandson, M.
529 El-Amine, A. Barr, A. Black, A. Langlois, O. Sonntag. (2020). L-Band Response to
530 Freeze/Thaw in a Boreal Forest Stand from Ground- and Tower-Based Radiometer
531 Observations. *Remote Sens. Environ.*, Vol. 237. DOI: 10.1016/j.rse.2019.111542

532 Schwank, M., R. Naderpour, C. Matzler. (2018). “Tau-Omega” – and Two-Stream Emission
533 Models Used for Passive L-Band Retrievals: Application to Close-Range Measurements
534 over a Forest. *Remote Sens.*, Vol. 10.

535 Seppanen, J., J. Kainulainen, J. Heiskanen, J. Praks, M. Hallikainen. (2016). Measurements of
536 Boreal Coniferous Forest Soil and Humus With an Airborne Radiometer. *IEEE Trans.*
537 *Geosci. Remote Sens.*, Vol. 9, No. 7.

538 Vittucci, C., P. Ferrazzoli, Y. Kerr, P. Richaume, L. Guerriero, R. Rahmoune, G. Vaglio Laurin.
539 (2016). SMOS Retrieval over Forests: Exploitation of Optical Depth and Tests of Soil
540 Moisture Estimates. *Remote Sens. Environ.*, Vol. 180, pp. 115-127.

541 Vittucci, C., P. Ferrazzoli, Y. Kerr, P. Richaume, G. Vaglio Laurin, L. Guerriero. (2019).
542 Analysis of Vegetation Optical Depth and Soil Moisture Retrieved by SMOS Over
543 Tropical Forests. *IEEE Geosci. Remote Sens. Lett.*, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp. 504-508.

Contents of this file


Figure S1

Figure S2

Introduction

This supporting information document contains two additional figures. Figure S1 shows the time-series of the in situ soil moisture and the retrieved soil moisture using the vertical and horizontal polarizations during the AM and PM overpasses for the MA and MB pixels. The in situ soil moisture uses the vertically installed sensors averaged over all valid stations. The plots include also the soil moisture from the operational SMAP radiometer-based soil moisture product (L2SMPE) using the vertically polarized single channel algorithm (SCA), which is the current baseline (BL). The SMAP BL retrievals generally overestimate the soil moisture while exhibiting some sensitivity to soil moisture dry downs for the partially forested MB site.

Figure S2 shows the temperature gradients measured at the two experiment sites during the AM and PM overpasses of SMAP. For computing the gradient the temperatures measured at the temporary stations at each domain were used. The 1.5 m aboveground air temperature was compared to each of the three soil temperatures (the temperature from the vertically installed sensor, the temperature from the sensor installed at 5 cm depth horizontally and the temperature from the sensor installed at 10 cm depth horizontally). Each type of measurement was averaged over the stations before computing the different.






Figure S1. Time-series of the in situ soil moisture measured using the vertically installed sensors and averaged over all valid stations with the retrieved soil moisture using vertical (V-pol) and horizontal (H-pol) polarizations during AM and PM overpasses for MA (top two plots) and MB (bottom two plots) pixels. Also included are the soil moisture retrievals from the operational SMAP radiometer-based soil moisture product (L2SMPE) using the vertically polarized single channel algorithm, which is the current baseline (BL). The shading shows the standard deviation of the measurements over the stations. The period of SMAP outage is marked with light red. The circled data points correspond to the outliers in Figure 2. There was also an outage of six stations in MA between early June and mid-July (which coincides largely with the SMAP outage); we did not use the average soil moisture during this period because it would have led to an inconsistent time-series.




Figure S2. Temperature gradients at the experiment sites measured by the different sensors of the temporary networks during the SMAP overpasses. The bars show the differences between the air temperature measured at 1.5 m aboveground (T_{air}) and the temperature measured by the different soil moisture sensors. The top two plots show the differences for the MA sites during AM and PM overpasses and the bottom two plots show the difference for the MB sites during the AM and PM overpasses. T_{s10} refers to the temperature measured by the soil moisture sensor at 10 cm depth, T_{s5} refers to the temperature measured by the soil moisture sensor at 5 cm depth, and T_{sv5} refers to the temperature measured by the vertically installed soil moisture sensor. The difference is always largest for T_{s10} , second largest for T_{s5} and smallest for T_{sv5} .