Jet Propulsion Laboratory
Interoffice Memorandum
MISR SCIENCE DFM \#153

April 10, 1998
To: Carol Bruegge
From: Nadine C. Lu Chrien
Subject: BRF measurements made for MISR OBC
CC:
The MISR facility for the measurement of bidirectional reflectance properties is described in "Directional reflectance characterization facility and measurement methodology" (McGuckin, et al 1996). Presented here are the results from the final measurements taken to represent the MISR protoflight calibration panels (PF-4 and PF-5). The names of the data files collected to characterize the hemispheric BRF are listed in Table 1 and Table 2.
The MISR reflectance data consist of two measurements: the incident signal, $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{i}}$ (referred to as "chan 1 out" in the data files), and the viewed (or reflectance) signal, $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{v}}$ (referred to as "chan 0 out" in the data files). These measurements are taken for both s-polarization incident and p-polarization incident illumination conditions. These data are then converted to BRF. The BRF for an unpolarized source is then computed by taking the average of the s-polarization incident and p-polarization incident BRFs.

$$
\begin{gather*}
\operatorname{BRF}\left(\theta_{i} ;\left(\theta_{r}, \phi_{r}\right)\right)=\frac{V_{v}\left(\theta_{i} ;\left(\theta_{r}, \phi_{r}\right)\right)}{V_{i}(\mathrm{REF})} \cdot \frac{1}{C_{\text {energy }} \Omega_{d} 10^{\mathrm{ND}}} \cdot \frac{1}{\cos \theta_{r}}  \tag{1}\\
C_{\text {energy }}=\frac{V_{v}(\text { energy calibration })}{V_{i}(\mathrm{REF})} \tag{2}
\end{gather*}
$$

where,
$\Omega_{d}$ is the detector solid angle, $10^{\mathrm{ND}}$ refers to the neutral density filter used in calibration, and $C_{\text {energy }}$ is the mean value from the energy files taken for the data set.

## Experimental Parameters

| $\lambda, \mathrm{nm}$ | $\Omega_{d}, \mathrm{sr}$ | $10^{\mathrm{ND}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 442 | $8.722 \mathrm{e}-4$ | 3.126 e 3 |
| 632 | $8.722 \mathrm{e}-4$ | 2.838 e 3 |
| 860 | $8.722 \mathrm{e}-4$ | 4.074 e 3 |

The reflectance data were collected at 632.8 nm with source elevation angles of $8^{\circ}, 40^{\circ}, 45^{\circ}, 50^{\circ}$ and $55^{\circ}$. The source azimuth angle was at $0^{\circ}$. For each of these angles of incidence, the detector viewed
the reflected signal at elevation angles, $\theta_{\mathrm{r}}$, of $1^{\circ}, 10^{\circ}, 20^{\circ}, 30^{\circ}, 40^{\circ}, 50^{\circ}, 60^{\circ}, 70^{\circ}$ and $80^{\circ}$. For each of these elevation angles, the detector viewed the reflected signal at azimuth angles, $\phi_{\mathrm{r}}$, from $0^{\circ}$ to $180^{\circ}$ at a sampling interval of $10^{\circ}$; symmetry in the BRF distribution for azimuth angles from $180^{\circ}$ to $360^{\circ}$ is assumed.

The measured BRF was resampled via spline interpolation/extrapolation and a numerical integration over the hemisphere was performed to arrive at the hemispheric reflectance factor (see Figure 1). The hemispheric reflectance factor (interpolated to 632 nm ) measured by Labsphere for a source at $8^{\circ}$ for the same sample was 0.983 ; a $0.8 \%$ difference from our result.

Table 1: Data files 'Position 2'" hemispheric, p-polarization incident

|  |  |  | $\theta_{\mathrm{i}}$ [degrees] |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 8 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 |
|  | calibration |  | 97 g 08140.934 | 97 g 08162.728 | 97 g 14180.132 | 97 g 15123.751 | 97 g 22145.922 |
|  | calibration |  | 97 g 08141.015 | 97 g 08162.828 | 97 g 14180.216 | 97 g 15124.523 | 97 g 22150.011 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathscr{N} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | 1 | 97 g 08141.725 | 97 g 08163.501 | 97 g 14180.624 | 97 g 15124.909 | 97 g 22150.621 |
|  |  | 10 | 97 g 08143.252 | 97 g 08164.605 | 97 g 14181.720 | 97 g 15130.313 | 97 g 22152.343 |
|  |  | 20 | 97 g 08145.246 | 97 g 08170.004 | 97 g 14182.822 | 97 g 15131.455 | 97 g 22153.506 |
|  |  | 30 | 97g08150.521 | 97 g 08171.047 | 97 g 14183.946 | 97 g 15132.547 | 97 g 22154.618 |
|  |  | 40 | 97 g 08151.718 | 97 g 08172.400 | 97 g 14185.137 | 97 g 15133.959 | 97 g 22155.805 |
|  |  | 50 | 97 g 08152.932 | 97 g 08173.730 | 97 g 14190.357 | 97 g 15135.151 | 97 g 22161.006 |
|  |  | 60 | 97g08154.230 | 97 g 08175.010 | 97 g 14191.603 | 97 g 15140.844 | 97 g 22162.414 |
|  |  | 70 | 97 g 08155.415 | 97 g 08180.425 | 97 g 14193.733 | 97 g 15142.511 | 97 g 22163.638 |
|  |  | 80 | 97g08160.654 | 97 g 08181.634 | 97 g 14195.012 | 97 g 15143.717 | 97 g 22164.915 |
| calibration |  |  | 97 g 08162.515 | 97 g 08183.231 | 97 g 14200.502 | 97 g 15150.323 | 97 g 22170.419 |
| calibration |  |  | 97g08162.554 | 97 g 08183.339 | 97 g 14200.541 | 97 g 15150.401 | 97 g 22170.513 |
| calibration |  |  | - | 97 g 14134.319 | - | - | - |

Table 2: Data files "Position 2" hemispheric, s-polarization incident



Figure 1. measured hemispheric BRF of test-piece 12669-2 to characterize PF calibration panels

The hemispheric measurements were performed on the test-piece as the laboratory setup did not allow such measurements to be done on the actual protoflight units. Only principal plane measurements could be done on the protoflight units. Figure 2 shows a comparison of the BRF in the principal plane (normalized to the BRF at $\theta_{\mathrm{r}}=0^{\circ}$ as there were no calibration files done for the protoflight panels). It was discovered that the test-piece had two distinct regions to it. Rotation of the test-piece by $90^{\circ}$ in the laboratory measurement setup did not affect the result. One region, referred to as "position 2" better matched the BRF results obtained from the protoflight units. The data from this position are the ones documented in this memorandum and which were provided as the "BRF database".

The protoflight panels, which are much longer than the test-piece did not exhibit this behavior when measured at various locations. It was subsequently noted by David Haner, who did the measurements, that there was a slight bump/dip in the test-piece in the vicinity of "position 1 ". It was barely noticeable and the anticipation was that the effect would be negligible. This was not however the case.


Figure 2. comparison of principal plane measurements on the protoflight panels with the test-piece

Figure 3 illustrates that the "position 2" data better characterize the MISR protoflight calibration panels. The expected range of view elevations from the MISR cameras is $9^{\circ}$ to $70^{\circ}$. The anticipated solar incidence angle onto the calibration panels is from $38^{\circ}$ to $55^{\circ}$. The azimuth angles relative to the source (which corresponds to our laboratory setup) will be on the $\phi_{r}=180^{\circ}$ side.
"Position $1^{\prime \prime}, \theta_{i}=45^{\circ}$ p -polarization incident


"Position $2^{\prime \prime}, \theta_{i}=45^{\circ}$ p -polarization incident
 $\theta_{r}[\mathrm{deg}]$
$\phi_{i}=180^{\circ}$.an_ratio $=$ average over all $\theta_{r}$
$\times$ PF-4, Aug95 $\times$ PF-4, Apr95 $\square$ PF-5, Aug95 $\quad$ PFF-5, Apr95

Figure 3. relative difference between protoflight panels and test-piece
The decision was made to acquire data for more illumination angles at a single wavelength ( 632 nm ) rather than to acquire fewer illumination angles at all possible wavelengths ( $442 \mathrm{~nm}, 632 \mathrm{~nm}$ and 860 nm ). The measurements that were done at 442 nm and 860 nm were made with the source at $55^{\circ}$ and at "Position 1". In the interest of getting the best set of data to characterize the protoflight panels, subsequent testing, including the comparison of different locations on the test-piece were done at 632 nm only. Comparisons of the BRF with wavelength are shown in Figure 4 and Figure 5 and Table 3 and Table 4. The relative difference is less than $2.5 \%$. As seen in Figure 2, the measurements for PF-4 and PF-5 vary by about $1 \%$ between Apr95 and Aug95. This could be due to slightly different locations on the panel having been measured or due to the realignment of the test setup. At any
rate, the error due solely to wavelength difference is likely to be less than the $2.5 \%$ shown. Other contributing factors are the uncertainty in the calibration of the neutral density filter (see equation 1), the alignment of the test setup. The 442 nm laser and the 860 nm laser are not as easily aligned nor I believe quite as stable as the 632 nm laser.
$\theta_{i}=55^{\circ}$, unpolarized


Figure 4. principal plane BRF with wavelength


Figure 5. absolute percent difference in BRF from 632 nm
In conclusion, the BRF of the MISR protoflight calibration panels has been characterized. The assumption has been made that spectral variations in the BRF between the MISR wavelengths will be negligible when compared to other issues such as spatial variations on the protoflight panels themselves and the necessity of using the test-piece to characterize the BRF of the calibration panels, rather than doing a hemispheric BRF measurement on each of the protoflight panels directly.

Table 3: Percent difference between BRF measured at $\theta_{i}=55^{\circ}$ and 442 nm and 632.8 nm [\%]

| $\begin{gathered} \phi_{\mathrm{r}} \\ {[\mathrm{deg}]} \end{gathered}$ | $\theta_{\mathrm{r}}$ [deg] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.0 | 10.0 | 20.0 | 30.0 | 40.0 | 50.0 | 60.0 | 70.0 | 80.0 |
| 0.0 | -1.3 | -1.3 | -1.1 | -1.2 | -1.6 | -1.2 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 1.7 |
| 10.0 | -1.3 | -1.2 | -1.0 | -1.1 | -1.5 | -0.7 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 1.2 |
| 20.0 | -1.3 | -1.6 | -1.1 | -0.7 | -1.0 | -0.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1.9 |
| 30.0 | -1.3 | -1.4 | -1.0 | -0.9 | -0.9 | -0.1 | -0.1 | 0.1 | 1.5 |
| 40.0 | -1.1 | -1.0 | -0.8 | -0.9 | -0.7 | -0.2 | 0.1 | -0.0 | 1.6 |
| 50.0 | -1.2 | -1.2 | -0.7 | -0.4 | 0.0 | -0.0 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.7 |
| 60.0 | -1.2 | -1.5 | -0.4 | -0.4 | -0.4 | -0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| 70.0 | -1.3 | -1.2 | -0.7 | -0.3 | -0.2 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 |
| 80.0 | -1.2 | -1.3 | -0.4 | -0.5 | 0.1 | -0.1 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1.3 |
| 90.0 | -1.3 | -1.4 | -0.4 | -0.3 | -0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 1.6 |
| 100.0 | -1.0 | -0.9 | -0.3 | -0.2 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.4 |
| 110.0 | -1.2 | -1.1 | -0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 1.1 |
| 120.0 | -1.4 | -0.8 | -0.4 | 0.3 | -0.1 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 0.6 |
| 130.0 | -1.4 | -0.7 | -0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 1.2 |
| 140.0 | -1.5 | -0.6 | 0.0 | -0.1 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| 151.0 | -1.4 | -0.1 | -0.3 | -0.1 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 1.0 |
| 160.0 | -1.4 | -0.7 | -0.4 | -0.2 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 1.7 |
| 170.0 | -1.4 | -0.5 | -0.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 1.6 |
| 180.0 | -1.3 | -0.4 | -0.1 | -0.1 | -0.1 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 1.1 |

Table 4: Percent difference between BRF measured at $\theta_{i}=55^{\circ}$ and 860 nm and 632.8 nm [\%]

| $\begin{gathered} \phi_{\mathrm{r}} \\ {[\mathrm{deg}]} \end{gathered}$ | $\theta_{\mathrm{r}}[\mathrm{deg}]$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1.0 | 10.0 | 20.0 | 30.0 | 40.0 | 50.0 | 60.0 | 70.0 | 80.0 |
| 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.0 | -0.1 | 0.4 | -1.2 | -1.3 | -1.6 |
| 10.0 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 | -0.2 | -0.5 | -1.0 | -1.8 | -1.2 | -1.2 |
| 20.0 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 | -0.8 | -1.1 | -0.6 | -1.2 | -1.4 |
| 30.0 | 0.7 | 0.2 | -0.0 | -0.2 | -0.7 | -1.1 | -1.1 | -0.8 | -1.1 |
| 40.0 | 0.9 | 0.6 | -0.2 | -0.6 | -0.8 | -1.4 | -1.3 | -1.2 | -0.5 |
| 50.0 | 0.8 | 0.2 | -0.2 | -0.6 | -0.6 | -1.2 | -0.7 | -0.3 | -1.5 |
| 60.0 | 0.8 | -0.2 | -0.2 | -0.8 | -0.9 | -1.3 | -1.0 | -1.1 | -0.4 |
| 70.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | -0.6 | -0.8 | -0.9 | -0.9 | -0.7 | -0.2 | -0.4 |
| 80.0 | 1.0 | -0.4 | -0.4 | -1.0 | -1.1 | -1.5 | -1.1 | -1.3 | -0.9 |
| 90.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | -0.4 | -0.8 | -1.5 | -1.0 | -0.6 | -1.2 | 0.1 |
| 100.0 | 0.6 | -0.2 | -0.3 | -1.1 | -1.1 | -1.2 | -1.1 | -0.9 | -0.3 |
| 110.0 | 0.6 | -0.5 | -0.4 | -1.0 | -1.7 | -1.3 | -1.0 | -1.0 | 0.0 |
| 120.0 | 0.5 | -0.4 | -1.0 | -0.9 | -1.5 | -1.4 | -1.3 | -0.5 | -0.1 |
| 130.0 | 0.5 | -0.3 | -0.8 | -1.4 | -1.5 | -1.4 | -1.2 | -1.5 | -0.4 |
| 140.0 | 0.4 | -0.1 | -0.7 | -1.3 | -1.8 | -1.7 | -1.1 | -1.7 | -0.4 |
| 151.0 | 0.5 | -0.4 | -1.0 | -1.4 | -1.8 | -1.3 | -1.3 | -1.8 | -0.2 |
| 160.0 | 0.4 | -0.5 | -0.9 | -1.5 | -2.4 | -2.1 | -2.2 | -2.1 | -0.9 |
| 170.0 | 0.4 | -0.1 | -1.0 | -1.4 | -1.8 | -1.6 | -1.8 | -2.1 | -0.9 |
| 180.0 | 0.6 | -0.5 | -1.0 | -1.5 | -2.2 | -2.0 | -1.9 | -2.0 | -0.8 |

