

Monitoring forestry outcomes in NSW native forests using airborne LiDAR

Methods and preliminary results

October 2023

Final Report

Enquiries

Enquiries about this report should be directed to:

Acknowledgement of Country

The Natural Resources Commission acknowledges and pays respect to traditional owners and Aboriginal peoples. The Commission recognises and acknowledges that traditional owners have a deep cultural, social, environmental, spiritual and economic connection to their lands and waters. We value and respect their knowledge in natural resource management and the contributions of many generations, including Elders, to this understanding and connection.

Acknowledgements

The Natural Resources Commission acknowledges the contribution of the following people for their advice in defining relevant LiDAR metrics and supporting the development of the analysis presented in this report: Professor Patrick Baker (University of Melbourne), Dr Geoff Horn (NSW Department of Planning and Environment) and Professor Scott Brown (University of Newcastle).

Citation

Brown, T., Hislop, S., Wall, J., Coates, Z., Liang, G., Voeste, J., Nguyen, A., Cooper, G. (2023) *Monitoring forestry outcomes in NSW native forests using airborne LiDAR*, NSW Natural Resources Commission, Sydney

This work is copyright. The *Copyright Act 1968* permits fair dealing for study, research, news reporting, criticism and review. Selected passages, table or diagrams may be reproduced for such purposes provided acknowledgement of the source is included.

Document No. D23/4411

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

Th[e Coastal Integrated Forestry Operations Approval](https://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/your-environment/native-forestry/integrated-forestry-operations-approvals/coastal-ifoa) (Coastal IFOA) sets out the rules for native timber harvesting in New South Wales (NSW) coastal state forests and establishes the environmental outcomes that must be achieved under the approval. The Coastal IFOA requires that the approval conditions are monitored to ensure they are effective in achieving the required objectives and outcome statements[.](#page-4-2)¹

The Environment Protection Authority (EPA) and Department of Primary Industries (DPI) have jointly approved the [Coastal IFOA Monitoring Program](https://www.nrc.nsw.gov.au/ifoa-mer) proposed by the NSW Forest Monitoring Steering Committee. The program sets out the broad framework to evaluate the effectiveness of priority conditions in meeting the Coastal IFOA objectives and outcomes. It centres on strategies to monitor and research forest health, biodiversity, water quality and aquatic habitat, and wood supply.

The program established key questions to focus monitoring on the Coastal IFOA objectives and outcomes. Landscape-scale monitoring questions include:

- Do harvesting conditions establish an appropriate mosaic of forest age classes at the landscape scale?
- **Are the conditions maintaining functional connectivity for focal fauna species to move** within and across the forest?
- Are the conditions effective in ensuring regenerating forests meet benchmarks for: (i) floristic composition (ii) forest structure (iii) coarse woody debris?
- Do the conditions establish enough key habitat features to maintain fauna species within and across the forest?
- To what extent are the conditions effectively managing the risk of new or existing areas subject to dieback?
- To what extent do the Coastal IFOA conditions maintain species occupancy in the landscape?
- Are the conditions affecting current commitments to meet wood supply?
- Are the conditions effectively promoting regeneration for long-term sustainable wood supply?

Understanding changes in forest structure at the local and landscape scale is critical to effectively answering these questions. This is supported by analysis of remote sensing data and integration with other spatial and non-spatial data.

1.1 Remote sensing supports landscape-scale monitoring

Multiple remote sensing methods are used in NSW to monitor public and private native forests, including passive and active sensors to assess the structure and condition of forest vegetation.

Passive sensors measure reflected energy from the sun or energy emitted from an object (i.e. heat). Passive sensors include cameras operating in the visible spectrum and multispectral instruments which typically collect information in the visible, near infrared and (sometimes) thermal infrared portions of the electromagnetic spectrum.

¹ [Coastal IFOA Conditions](https://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/-/media/epa/corporate-site/resources/forestagreements/18p1177-coastal-ifoa-conditions.pdf?la=en&hash=E437EFD84FE1B1002AFF69DB1A13336319FF5A56) (Chapter 8) an[d Coastal IFOA Protocols](https://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/-/media/epa/corporate-site/resources/forestagreements/coastal-ifoa-protocols.pdf?la=en&hash=62F5AFBB969D14D13A1FDFDE003B7BE8081A50D1) (Protocol 38).

Active sensors transmit energy directly and measure the returning signal. Active sensors include radar, sonar and LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging).

Sensors can be mounted on ground-based platforms, airborne platforms (i.e. aircraft, unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs)) or satellites – which affects the area able to be captured and the resolution of data captured.

Once collected, remotely sensed data must be processed into products and information to provide knowledge and insights to support decision-making.

A detailed discussion of the types and suitability of remote sensing methods for monitoring NSW native forests was prepared by Hislop and Stone (2023) to support the development of the NSW Private Native Forestry MER Framework²[.](#page-5-2)

1.2 Airborne LiDAR enables landscape-scale forest structure analysis

Airborne LiDAR (Airborne Laser Scanning; ALS) allows the 3D structure of forests to be evaluated across large areas with reduced effort and costs compared to ground-based measurements, and for some parameters at greater accuracy than by field crews using manual methods.

Forest structural metrics derived from ALS can be categorized into four main categories:

- cover
- height
- horizontal variability
- vertical variability

These 3D metrics can be combined with other spatial and non-spatial datasets to describe how forest structural characteristics relate to forest values and disturbance history.

1.3 New airborne LiDAR available for NSW coastal state forests

New ALS data and co-incident high-resolution imagery were captured across 250,000 ha of state forests in eastern NSW between August 2022 and April 2023 [\(Figure 1\)](#page-6-0).

Sites were selected to cover the range of forest types, areas burnt and unburnt during the 2019-20 wildfires, fauna monitoring sites, forest inventory plots, completed and proposed harvesting areas, and areas managed for conservation.

² Hislop, S. & Stone, C. (2023) *Remote sensing of NSW private native forests – options and feasibility*, Report prepared for the NSW Natural Resources Commission, Sydney

Figure 1 – Airborne LiDAR capture areas over state forests in 2022 and 2023

2 Methods used to process and analyse ALS data

The Natural Resources Commission chaired a small working group comprised of experts in forest-based spatial and remote sensing analysis to advise on suitable ALS-derived metrics and methods to answer the key monitoring questions. The working group was comprised of:

- Professor Patrick Baker, The University of Melbourne
- Dr Geoff Horn, NSW Department of Planning and Environment
- Dr Sam Hislop, FLINTpro, Mullion Group
- Dr Julian Wall, 2rog
- Tony Brown, Forestry Corporation of NSW

This section outlines the methods used to process the ALS data into spatial layers and the subsequent analysis undertaken by the working group and a team from the University of Newcastle.

2.1 Airborne laser scanning (ALS) data acquired in 2022 and 2023

The ALS data were acquired by Aerometrex Pty Ltd, using a RIEGL VQ-780II sensor, at different times throughout 2022 and 2023 [\(Table 1\)](#page-7-3).

The ALS data has a point density of approximately 30 points per $m²$ and was delivered by the supplier in a point-cloud (LAS) format, split into tiles of 500m x 500m.

Table 1 – LiDAR capture areas and dates

The state forests covered by each capture area are listed in Appendix 1.

2.2 LiDAR data processing methods

This data was processed using the LidR package in R package LidR (Roussel et al. 2020) on an Amazon Web Services (AWS) machine supplied by Forestry Corporation of NSW (FCNSW). LidR enables efficient parallel processing of large LiDAR datasets.

The processing steps, including code, are outlined in detail in the Appendix 2: ALS processing steps in R. They are briefly described here.

2.2.1 Height normalisation

LiDAR discrete return sensors emit laser pulses and measure the time taken for the reflected energy to return to the sensor. From the elapsed time, the distance between the sensor and object can be calculated. Because tree canopies contain many gaps, each pulse may have multiple returns. The 'first' returns are more likely to be the points that represent the forest canopy, while 'last' returns often indicate the ground.

Height normalisation replaces the Z (height) value for every point from an absolute measure (i.e., above sea level) to a relative measure from the ground. The normalised point cloud can then be used to determine the height of vegetation [\(Figure 2\)](#page-8-0).

Prior to calculating relative heights, however, the ground surface must be modelled. Here, a triangulated irregular network (TIN) method was used to create the ground surface model. In a TIN, each 'ground' point is triangulated from its closest two points to create a surface. Because we only want to triangulate between ground points, the point cloud needs to be classified prior to this function being run. The data from the supplier is usually already classified into basic classes (ground, vegetation).

Figure 2 - Example of an initial point cloud (left) and a height normalized point cloud (right)

2.2.2 Canopy height models

A canopy height model (CHM) is a 2-dimensional representation of canopy height across an area (e.g., the LiDAR coverage extent) [\(Figure 3\)](#page-9-0).

There are many different methods in the literature for generating CHMs. The simplest, conceptually, is to place a grid with a cell size of, for example, 1m across the area and take the highest point in each cell. However, this can lead to canopy 'pits' and a poor-quality output which looks speckled.

Here, the 'pit-free' algorithm of Khosravipour et al. (2014) was used to generate a smoother, more realistic output. After running the algorithm, a few individual pixels were unmapped (no-data). These were filled based on the mean of the surrounding 8 pixels using the R package terra (Hijmans 2023).

Figure 3 - Example of a 3D point-cloud (left) and canopy height model (right)

2.2.3 LiDAR metrics

LiDAR metrics are summary statistics of all the points in a specified area, typically based on the distribution of height values (vertical profile) [\(Figure 4\)](#page-9-1).

Here, the Z-values (height) are summarised across the landscape using a 30m grid. Therefore, in each 30 x 30 m cell, all the points in that cell are summarised into a single value (e.g., the 95th percentile, the mean, etc.) with the output being a raster surface.

Figure 4 - Example of a 3D point cloud (left) and the corresponding distribution of height values (right), with the 50th and 95th percentiles shown in red

In this analysis, the first returns only were used to generate the LiDAR metrics shown in [Table 2.](#page-15-0)

Table 2. LiDAR metrics created for this analysis

2.2.5 Forest structure index

FCNSW has developed a 'forest structure index', which uses the 1m CHM to produce a surface representing forest structure across a broader landscape.

The steps to create the structure index are:

1. Square the CHM value for each 1m pixel

2. Aggregate to 5m pixels, using the sum of squared CHM values for each 1m pixel

4. Create a focal sum using a $\overline{9x9}$ pixel window (i.e. 81, 5m pixels). Where the output value for an individual 5m pixel is the sum of the input values for itself and the surrounding 80 cells. The image below shows the pixels used to calculate the focal sum (top) and the diagonally adjacent output values (bottom).

The result is a raster with 5m pixels where each cell represents the sum of the squared height across 0.2 ha. The resulting forest structure index is illustrated in [Figure 5.](#page-13-1)

Figure 5 – Example forest structure index

2.3 Method to develop structural connectivity index

2.3.1 Context

The configuration and contiguity of native vegetation communities in a landscape, or conversely the degree to which natural systems have been fragmented through modification (e.g. intensive harvesting), are important factor when considering forest resilience and the persistence of native species.

Vegetation connectivity can be referred to as 'structural connectivity' which is simply an index of the connectedness of the native vegetation across landscapes³[,](#page-13-2) or 'functional connectivity' which relates to the ease with which processes such as species dispersal can operate.

Examples of structural connectivity include large connected patches, linear elements such as corridors, and partially vegetated drainage lines or fence lines. It may consist of more subtle habitat elements such as scattered trees, often referred to as "stepping stones" because of their scattered, non-linear structur[e](#page-13-3)⁴ .

Functional connectivity is distinguished from structural connectivity in the context that conservation value accrues to patches or stepping stones only if animals in real landscapes

³ Bélisle, M. (2005). Measuring landscape connectivity: the challenge of behavioural landscape ecology. *Ecology*. 86: 1988-1995.

⁴ Doerr, V.A.J., Doerr, E.D. and Davies, M.J. (2010). *Does structural connectivity facilitate dispersal of native species in Australia's fragmented terrestrial landscapes?* Systematic Review No. 44, Collaboration of Environmental Evidence. CSIRO. Canberra.

use them to bring about connectivity⁵[.](#page-14-0) Patches of native vegetation are connected functionally if a species can cross the non-habitat area (matrix) between those habitat patches successfully⁶[.](#page-14-1)

Structural connectivity considers the structure of the forest-gap matrix, while functional connectivity considers the capacity of individual species to move within this matrix.

Functional connectivity is more complex because what is functionally connected for one species might not be for another species.

In this trial we consider structural connectivity only, and we make a broad assumption that for most species, 'connected' forested will be preferred over 'fragmented' forest, which will be preferred over 'forest edge', which will be preferred over forest gaps, for occupancy and movement.

2.3.2 Approach to develop connectivity index using 6m threshold

The CHM was reclassified into a binary patch layer with a 5x5m pixel resolution, based on a 6 m height threshold which is a recognised cutoff between 'low' trees and 'mid-tall' trees (Australian soil and land survey handbook⁷ [\)](#page-14-2). The two classes were:

- $≥ 6m = 1$
- $\le 6m = 0$

The CHM was smoothed whereby any '1' pixel that was entirely surrounded by '0' pixels was converted to '0', and any '0' pixel that was entirely surrounded by '1' pixels was converted to '1'.

A 30 m buffer was then established around each separate forest patch (connected groups of cells with value = 1), and concentric 30m buffers were created around these, demarking different distance bands to the nearest adjacent forest. The layer was then converted to a structural connectivity layer with 10 classes [\(Table 2\)](#page-15-0).

⁵ Beier, P. and Noss, R.F. (1998). Do habitat corridors provide connectivity? Conservation Biology. 12: 1241-1252. ⁶ Tischendorf, L. and Fahrig, L. (2000). On the usage and measurement of landscape connectivity. Oikos. 90: 7- 19.

⁷ McDonald, R.C., Isbell, R. F., Speight, J.G., Walker, J. and Hopkins, M.S. (1984). Australian soil and land survey. Field handbook. Inkata, Melbourne. pp 165

Table 2 - Structural connectivity classes attributed to CHM-derived patch layer (height threshold = 6m)

B. Spatial extent of the 30 m buffer includes the patch from which it was derived

2.3.3 Approach to develop connectivity index using 12m threshold

The CHM was also reclassified into a binary layer with a 5x5m pixel resolution, based on a 12 m height threshold, which is a recognised cutoff between 'mid-tall' trees and 'tall' trees (Australian soil and land survey handbook), and likely separates non-forest and early regrowth forest from advanced regrowth, mixed, mature and old forest. The two classes were:

- \blacksquare \ge 12m = 1
- $< 12m = 0$

As with the 6 m threshold, the CHM was smoothed, then a 60 m buffer was established around each separate forest patch (patches with value = 1), and concentric 60 m buffers were created around these, demarking different distance bands to the nearest adjacent forest. The layer was then converted to a structural connectivity layer with eight classes [\(Table 3\)](#page-16-0).

Table 3 – Structural connectivity classes attributed to CHM-derived patch layer (height threshold = 12m)

D. Spatial extent of the 60 m buffer includes the patch from which it was derived

[Figure 6](#page-16-1) provides an example of outputs across the Coffs Harbour area showing the reclassified CHM using the 6m threshold, and the derived structural connectivity surfaces for the 6m threshold. [Figure 7](#page-17-0) shows the same for the 12m threshold.

Figure 6 - Binary layer derived using the 6m height cut-off (left) and connectivity layer derived from the 6m cut-off data (right)

Figure 7 - Binary layer derived using the 12m height cut-off (left) and connectivity layer derived from the 12m cut-off data (right)

3 Interpretation of LiDAR outputs

The LiDAR metrics described in the previous section can be combined with other spatial data to add context and to allow deeper analysis of impacts of different natural and anthropogenic drivers of change.

It should be noted that the LiDAR data was captured between 2.5 and 3 years after the 2019/20 wildfires. During this time above average rainfall occurred across the LiDAR capture regions providing favourable conditions for forest recovery.

3.1 Exploring the relationship between time since harvest and LiDAR metrics

Time since last harvest was intersected with the LiDAR metric rasters [\(Figure 8\)](#page-18-2). This, in a sense, swaps space for time.

By summarising the values of each LiDAR metric in the area harvested in a given year, it is possible to look at the relationship between time since harvest and vegetation structure. For example, how do areas ten years post-harvest compare with areas two years postharvest?

The methods here required existing spatial datasets for harvest history in native forests and plantation data, which was used to mask out areas of plantation within the capture areas.

Figure 8 - The CHM for Coffs Harbour with recent harvest history overlaid

Document No: D23/4411 Page 15 of 41

Status: DRAFT Version: 0.1 Status: DRAFT

Outputs from this analysis are shown i[n Figure 9.](#page-19-0) Here, we can infer that canopy cover returns to its baseline state seven years after harvest, whereas canopy height takes more like 15 years.

Figure 9 - Summary statistics based on time since harvest for Coffs Harbour, including LiDAR metrics for canopy top height (p95), average height (avg), canopy cover (cov), standard deviation (sd), coefficient of variation (cv) and skewness.

A similar analysis was conducted for each LiDAR capture area comparing mean top height (p95) and mean canopy cover within the base net area (BNA) and forests in the same area managed for conservation, using the method described in section 3.2. [Figure 10](#page-20-0) and [Figure](#page-20-1) [11](#page-20-1) show the mean top height (p95) and mean canopy cover respectively in each region by harvest year for each area of BNA.

Further exploration of the data is needed to account for different forest types commonly found in areas managed for conservation compared to forest within the BNA within the same operational area.

• Other year • Recent year

Figure 10 – Mean p95 CHM return for conservation areas (red line) and BNA by year harvested

Figure 11 – Mean canopy cover for conservation areas (red line) and BNA by year harvested

3.2 Analysing LiDAR metrics and forest variability

Integration and analysis of spatial data and LiDAR metrics was conducted using R. [Figure](#page-21-1) [12](#page-21-1) provides an overview of the data preparation and processing steps. The R code used for the analysis is detailed in Appendix 2. The spatial data used in the analysis are listed in Appendix 3.

Figure 12 – Process used to prepare and analyse LiDAR metrics and other spatial data

SpatRasters are spatially referenced surfaces which store data within pixels. This is the process used for storing LiDAR data for extraction and analysis.

SpatVectors are used to store vector data such as points, polygons and other attributes. Geometry within a SpatRaster is identified by Polygons, often MultiPolygons. These Polygons are of varying shape and identify a specific location within the SpatRaster. This location is identified using a coordinate reference system (CRS).

Using SpatRasters of forest data and SpatVectors enables LiDAR metrics to be extracted,

such as fires or harvesting method, may have on forest variability. This process involves first, extracting data from the SpatRaster, which provides the associated LiDAR metrics for points in the SpatVector. From this the mean, max and standard deviation are extracted. The extracted data is then spatially joined to the SpatVector data frame by matching polygons within the same location. This is similar to how a left-join may work with a common variable.

The process of extracting data from SpatRasters allows the calculation of factors such as slope within forests, and examine how slope position may impact forest structure. To calculate slope data is extracted from a Digital Terrain Model (DTM), which is a SpatRaster that contains topography data of a rectangular grid. The topographic data is used to calculate a Topographic Position Index and classify each polygon within 6 slope position variables:

- valley
- lower slope
- middle slope
- flat slope
- upper slope
- ridge.

The extracted slope metrics are then joined to the SpatVector to examine the effect of slope and fire severity from the 2019/20 wildfires on forest characteristics.

3.2.1 Slope position and fire severity affect mean tree height and canopy cover

Slope position is known to influence forest type and productivity due to soil conditions and moisture availability, which also influences fire behaviour. [Figure 13](#page-23-0) shows the trends in mean P95 CHM returns and canopy cover for each slope position and fire extent and severity mapping (FESM) category for three of the LiDAR capture areas. There is a general trend of lower tree top height and canopy cover as fire severity increases, combined with a trend of decreasing mean P95 CHM returns from the lower valley slope position to ridges.

Figure 13 – Effect of slope position and fire severity on P95 CHM return and canopy cover

The same data is presented in [Figure 14](#page-23-1) to illustrate the effect of fire severity on mean top height and canopy cover.

Metric · meancoverage · meanp95

Figure 14 – P95 CHM returns and canopy cover by fire severity category

3.2.2 Tree height distribution illustrates mosaic of forest age classes

The distribution of P95 CHM returns can be extracted from LiDAR metrics to illustrate the variation across forests from the local to the landscape scale.

[Figure 15](#page-24-0) shows the P95 CHM returns distribution for one whole Local Landscape Area (LLA) within the Port Macquarie region ('Bottle Brush').

Figure 15 – Density of P95 CHM return by P95 CHM value for Bottle Brush Local Landscape Area coloured by compartment number

[Figure 16](#page-25-0) shows the distribution for each compartment within the same LLA.

Figure 16 - Density of P95 CHM return by P95 CHM value for each compartment within the Bottle Brush Local Landscape Area

Return distribution can also be identified for common zones within forest management areas to differentiate between features excluded from harvesting to meet soil stability or biodiversity conservation goals, as illustrated i[n Figure 17.](#page-25-1)

Figure 17 – Number of P95 CHM returns by P95 CHM value for trees within harvest exclusion zones in compartments KRW004 & KRW005 in the Bottle Brush LLA

The analysis can be repeated at any scale from Patch (approx. 10ha) to Compartment (approx. 300 to 500ha) to Local Landscape Area (approx. 1,500ha), with mean top height (p95) shown at each scale to show the mosaic across the forested area. This is illustrated in [Figure 18](#page-26-0) to [Figure 21.](#page-27-0)

Figure 18 – Mean top height (p95) mosaic at the LLA scale (left) and for compartments within the Base Net Area (right) for the Eden LiDAR capture area

Figure 19 – Mean top height (p95) mosaic at the LLA scale (left) and for compartments within the Base Net Area (right) for the Styx River LiDAR capture area

Figure 20 – Mean top height (p95) mosaic at the LLA scale (left) and for compartments within the Base Net Area (right) for the Batemans Bay LiDAR capture area

Figure 21 – Mean top height (p95) mosaic at the LLA scale (left) and for compartments within the Base Net Area (right) for the Casino LiDAR capture area

4 Conclusions

This report has presented the methods used to process and analyse recently acquired ALS data in a selection of State forests in NSW. The data provides a wealth of information with respect to forest structure across the landscape, including in areas where recent harvesting has taken place and areas affected by the 2019/20 wildfires.

4.1 Suitability of data and methods for monitoring impact of the Coastal IFOA on forest values

Airborne LiDAR data and spatial analysis can provide high-resolution information about forest structure and its relationship to topography, natural disturbances and forest management activities. This is particularly useful for monitoring temporal changes in forest structure, health and habitat diversity.

However, while airborne LiDAR provides a comprehensive characterisation of forest structure across the landscape, by itself it is somewhat limited in its ability to represent forest composition and function without the integration of additional information.

The analysis presented in this report has integrated LiDAR-derived metrics with spatial data for forest management boundaries, fire history and harvesting history to explore relationships and develop outputs that could be used to answer Coastal IFOA monitoring questions. Further analysis and interpretation of outputs is required to address specific monitoring questions.

4.2 Next steps

In line with the objectives of the Coastal IFOA monitoring program and the NSW Government commitment to open data the following will be implemented:

- Raw data and derived metrics will be made publicly available to enable other researchers to add to the body of knowledge and to support transparency in the assessment of impacts of forestry practices
- The analysis will be extended to include previous LiDAR data captures over the same areas and analyse change over time, including identifying drivers of change where data is available

4.4 Recommendations for further work

The ALS captured here is an extremely valuable resource which could be analysed further to gain other insights. In particular, integration with field data would allow models of target variables to be generated (e.g., aboveground biomass, tree species).

Recommendations for further work include:

- Integrate other spatial and non-spatial data (e.g. site quality, inventory plots, DPI 2018 feasibility study) into analysis
- **Integrate LiDAR metrics into analysis of Coastal IFOA fauna monitoring results and** species occupancy modelling, as well as input to research into habitat suitability under the koala research program
- **Integrate LiDAR metrics with other field-based and remote sensing analysis of forest** recovery following the 2019-2020 wildfires
- Further explore structural diversity within local landscape areas by integrating management and natural disturbance histories
- Further explore the effect of fire severity on structural characteristics of different forest types and landscape positions
- Explore how imputation methods could be used to extrapolate analysis across other state forest areas

5 References

Alberti, G. (2023). Landform package in R. 10.13140/RG.2.2.33628.36483/1.

Appelhans, T., Detsch, F., Reudenbach, C., & Woellauer, S. (2016, April). mapview-Interactive viewing of spatial data in R. In *EGU General Assembly Conference Abstracts* (pp. EPSC2016- 1832).

Beier, P. and Noss, R.F. (1998). Do habitat corridors provide connectivity? *Conservation Biology*. 12: 1241-1252.

Cheng, J., Karambelkar, B., & Xie, Y. Leaflet: Create Interactive Web Maps with the JavaScript 'Leaflet'Library; R Package Version 2.0. 4.1. 2021.

Evans, J. S., & Ram, K. (2021). Package 'spatialEco'. *R CRAN Project*.

Hijmans RJ. 2023. terra: Spatial Data Analysis [Internet]. [https://CRAN.R](https://cran.r-project.org/package=terra)[project.org/package=terra](https://cran.r-project.org/package=terra)

Hijmans, R. J., Van Etten, J., Mattiuzzi, M., Sumner, M., Greenberg, J. A., Lamigueiro, O. P., ... & Shortridge, A. (2013). Raster package in R. *Version. https://mirro rs. sjtug. sjtu. edu. cn/cran/web/packa ges/rast e r/raster. pdf*.

Khosravipour A, Skidmore AK, Isenburg M, Wang T, Hussin YA. 2014. Generating Pit-free Canopy Height Models from Airborne Lidar. Photogramm Eng Remote Sens. 80(9):863– 872.

McDonald, R.C., Isbell, R. F., Speight, J.G., Walker, J. and Hopkins, M.S. (1984). *Australian soil and land survey. Field handbook*. Inkata, Melbourne. pp 165

Pebesma E, Bivand R (2023). *Spatial Data Science: With applications in R*. Chapman and Hall/CRC[. doi:10.1201/9780429459016,](https://doi.org/10.1201/9780429459016) [https://r-spatial.org/book/.](https://r-spatial.org/book/)

Roussel J-R, Auty D, Coops NC, Tompalski P, Goodbody TRH, Meador AS, Bourdon J-F, de Boissieu F, Achim A. 2020. lidR: An R package for analysis of Airborne Laser Scanning (ALS) data. *Remote Sens Environ*. 251:112061.

Tennekes M (2018). "tmap: Thematic Maps in R." *Journal of Statistical Software*, **84**(6), 1–39. [doi:10.18637/jss.v084.i06.](https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v084.i06)

Tischendorf, L. and Fahrig, L. (2000). On the usage and measurement of landscape connectivity. *Oikos*. 90: 7-19.

Wickham H, Averick M, Bryan J, Chang W, McGowan LD, François R, Grolemund G, Hayes A, Henry L, Hester J, Kuhn M, Pedersen TL, Miller E, Bache SM, Müller K, Ooms J, Robinson D, Seidel DP, Spinu V, Takahashi K, Vaughan D, Wilke C, Woo K, Yutani H (2019). "Welcome to the tidyverse." *Journal of Open Source Software*, **4**(43), 1686. [doi:10.21105/joss.01686.](https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686)

Wickham, H., François, R., Henry, L., & Müller, K. (2018). dplyr: A Grammar of Data Manipulation. R package version 0.7. 6. *Computer software]. https://CRAN. R-project. org/package= dplyr*.

Appendix 1 –State forests within each LiDAR capture area

Appendix 2 –ALS processing steps in R

Airborne laser scanning (ALS) is increasingly used to create enhanced forest inventories and monitor forest structure.

Typically, the company that acquires the data supplies it as 3D point clouds which are split into tiles of (e.g., 1km by 1km) to aid processing.

This document outlines the steps taken to create a canopy height model (CHM) and a range of lidar 'metrics' from the point cloud data. The lidR package in R was used to process the data, but the steps are more-or-less comparable when using other lidar processing software (e.g., Lastools, Fusion).

Install and load the required packages:

```
library(lidR) # package for processing of las files
library(future) # allows multi-core processing
library(sf) # spatial features package, for working with vector-based 
spatial data
library(terra) # a raster processing package
library(PerformanceAnalytics)
```
Set the working directory (or use relative path names):

setwd(<directory where LAZ directory is located>) indir <- 'LAZ' *# directory name where las files are located*

To get the boundaries of the las files (for use in a GIS) the following script can be used:

```
ctg <- readLAScatalog(indir) #read in the catalogue of las files
spx <- as.spatial(ctg) # convert catalogue boundaries to spatial layer
spx <- st_as_sf(spx) # convert sp object to sf object
st_crs(spx) <- 'EPSG:7856' # set projection if needed (GDA 2020 zone 56)
dir.create('shapes')
```

```
st_write(spx, 'shapes/lidar_boundaries.shp', append=FALSE) # write out as 
shape file
```
Some tiles around the edges of the acquisition area contain too few points to adequately process, so we can remove (or move) files less than 50kb in size with the following code if required:

```
dir.create(paste0('LAZ/toosmall'))
x \leftarrow list.files(indir, pattern='las', full.names = T)
x \leftarrow x[sapply(x, file.size) < 50000]
file.rename(x, paste0('LAZ/toosmall/',basename(x)))
```
Height Normalisation

Height normalization replaces the Z (height) value for every point from an absolute measure (i.e., above sea level) to a relative measure from the ground. Therefore, in a forest the Z value will become the vegetation height above the ground.

The following code reads in a catalogue of las files, sets some processing options and then runs the normalize_height function from the lidR package.

```
ctg <- readLAScatalog(indir) # read in the catalogue
# Create directory for writing normalized files
outdir <- 'Normalized'
dir.create(outdir)
# Set some processing options
opt_output_files(ctg) <- paste0(outdir, "/{*}") # this writes out the files 
instead of holding them in memory
opt_laz_compression(ctg) <- TRUE # this writes out files as compressed laz 
files instead of las files
opt_filter(ctg) <- "-drop_class 7" # drop points classified as 'noise'
opt_chunk_buffer(ctg) <- 10 # change the buffer size if desired
# Using the future package, multi-core parameters are set (use 
plan(multisession, workers=n) to limit number of cores if problems with 
memory)
plan(multisession)
# The normalize function from the lidR is then called
normalize height(ctg, tin())
```
The above can take many hours, depending on the size of the dataset and computer specifications. lidR automatically displays a handy progress plot.

Note that the 'TIN' method of height normalization is used here. A triangulated irregular network (TIN) triangulates between points to create a surface. Because we only want to triangulate between ground points, the point cloud needs to be classified prior to this function being run. The data from the supplier is usually already classified into basic classes (ground, vegetation, etc.)

It is important to note that each tile needs to be buffered to avoid edge effects between tiles (i.e., triangulation will use points from neighbouring tiles). Luckily, lidR creates on-thefly buffers of 30 m by default. The buffer size can be modified if desired, using: e.g., opt_chunk_buffer(ctg) <- 10

If, for some reason, the processing fails and R crashes, the following code allows processed files to be flagged so they are not processed again. This will need to be inserted above after reading in the catalogue.

```
ctg2 <- readLAScatalog(outdir)
spctg2 \leftarrow as.spatial(ctg2)ctg <- catalog_intersect(
    ctg,
    spctg2,
   subset = "flag unprocessed"
 )
```
Canopy Height Model (CHM)

A CHM is a 2-dimensional representation of canopy height across the extent of lidar coverage. Many different algorithms have been proposed. The most simple, conceptually, is to place a grid with a cell size of, for example, 1m across the area and simply take the highest point in each cell. However, this can lead to canopy 'pits' and a poor quality output which looks speckled.

In the following code, the 'pit-free' algorithm of Khosravipour et al (2014) was used.

```
indir <- 'Normalized'
outdir <- 'Products/CHM'
dir.create('Products')
dir.create(outdir)
plan(multisession)
ctg <- readLAScatalog(indir) # as above, read in the catalogue, this time 
using the normalized files
opt_select(ctg) <- "xyz" # selecting only the xyz values of the points may 
use less memory
opt_output_files(ctg) <- paste0(outdir, "/{*}") # this will create 
individual output files for each tile. Only needed for large datasets, 
otherwise these are stored in memory and merged at the end.
# The function to create the CHM is as follows. This uses the pit-free 
algorithm, with specified height and edge parameters
chm \leftarrow rasterize_canopy(ctg, res = 1, algorithm = pitfree(thresholds = c(0,10, 20, 30), max edge = c(0, 1.5), pkg = "terra")
z56 <- 'EPSG:7856' # GDA 2020 projection specification
crs(chm) <- z56 # set coordinate reference system
# The pit-free algorithm may still output a raster with some no-data 
pixels. The following function from the terra package fills any NA pixels 
with the mean of the surrounding pixels
chm <- focal(chm, w=3, fun='mean', na.rm=T, na.policy='only')
writeRaster(chm, 'Products/chm_1m.tif', overwrite=T) # write the output 
raster
```
LiDAR Metrics

LiDAR metrics are summary statistics of all of the points in a specified area. In the following, the Z values (height) are summarised across the landscape using a 30m grid. Therefore, in each 30 x 30 m cell, all the points in that cell are summarised into a single value (e.g., the 95th percentile, the mean, etc.)

```
# read in the catalogue of normalized point clouds and set some parameters
indir <- 'Normalized'
ctg <- readLAScatalog(indir)
opt_select(ctg) <- "xyz"
opt_filter(ctg) <- "-first_only" # filter the point cloud to only use first 
returns
# This function calculates five common lidar metrics (cover, p95, average 
height, standard deviation and skewness)
f = function(z)
 {
   cov = length(z[z>2])/length(z)*100q95 = quantile(z, 0.95)
   avg = mean(z)sd = sd(z) skew = PerformanceAnalytics::skewness(z)
   return(list(cov = cov, q95 = q95, avg = avg, sd = sd, skew = skew))
 }
plan(multisession)
# run the pixel_metrics function, using a 30 metre grid size
metrics = pixel metrics(ctg, ~(f(Z), 30)# set the projection information
z56 <- 'EPSG:7856'
crs(metrics) <- z56
# write out the rasters as individual files
terra::writeRaster(metrics[[1]], 'Products/cov_firstOnly_30m.tif', 
overwrite=T)
terra::writeRaster(metrics[[2]], 'Products/p95_firstOnly_30m.tif', 
overwrite=T)
terra::writeRaster(metrics[[3]], 'Products/avg_firstOnly_30m.tif', 
overwrite=T)
terra::writeRaster(metrics[[4]], 'Products/sd_firstOnly_30m.tif', 
overwrite=T)
terra::writeRaster(metrics[[5]], 'Products/skewness_firstOnly_30m.tif', 
overwrite=T)
```
Structural Index

The FCNSW structural index produces a surface representing structure across a broader landscape. The following code creates a custom 'forest structure index' from the 1m CHM:

```
chm <- rast('Products/chm_1m.tif') # load in the raster
chm <- chm*chm # square the CHM
chm <- terra::aggregate(chm, fact=5, fun='sum', na.rm=T) # aggregate to 5m 
cells, using the sum
structindex <- focal(chm, w=9, fun='sum') # create a focal sum using 9x9 
cells surrounding each pixel
```

```
writeRaster(structindex, 'Products/structural_index_5m.tif', overwrite=T)
```
Calculating descriptive values from LiDAR metrics

The following R code was developed by the Zac Coates, Garston Liang, Augustine Nguyen, Johanna Voeste, Gavin Cooper and Scott Brown from the University of Newcastle to integrate LiDAR metrics with spatial data and generate insights about the relationship between forest structure, natural features and disturbance history.

```
#Load required packages
require(tidyverse)
require(sf)
require(terra)
require(dplyr)
#load required data of multipolygon boundaries (vector)
boundaries info <- st layers("Data/DataExtraction.gdb")
boundaries \langle -1 list() ## To store all the boundaries, for different layers.
for (i in 1:length(boundaries_info$name)) {
   boundaries[[i]] <-
st_read("Data/DataExtraction.gdb",layer=boundaries_info$name[i])
}
#save names of boundaries
names(boundaries) <- boundaries_info$name
#fix geometry type of boundary (this may not be required for all 
boundaries)
somepolys <- boundaries [[1]] 
somepolys <- st cast(somepolys, "MULTIPOLYGON")
```
#load lidar data for extraction (raster)

somedatcasino <- terra::rast("metrics/Area1 Casino avg firstOnly 30m.tif")

#transform so crs (coordinate reference system) of vector and raster are the same

```
somepolys <- st transform(somepolys, st crs(somedatcasino))
```
#extract mean, standard deviation, and max from raster for each multipolygon

```
casinomean <- terra::extract(x=somedatcasino, y=somepolys, fun=mean)
casinosd <- terra::extract(x=somedatcasino, y=somepolys, fun=sd)
casinomax <- terra::extract(x=somedatcasino, y=somepolys, fun=max)
```
#bind extracted descriptive data back to vector data somepolys <- cbind(casinomean, somepolys)

#Identify which raster capture data was extracted from # vector of column names to check

columns_to_check <- c(2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16)

```
# new column "capture_id" with NA values in your 'somepolys' dataframe
somepolys$capture_id_b1 <- NA
```
loop through each row and check the specified columns

```
for (i in 1:nrow(somepolys)) {
  for (col in columns to check) {
     if (!is.na(somepolys[i, col])) {
      somepolys[i, "capture id b1"] <- (col - 1) %/% 2 + 1
       break
     }
   }
}
```
#clean up data converging data from all raster captures

```
# make replacement columns list 
replacement_column_numbers <- c(4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14,16)
main_column_number <-2 # should be avg column
```

```
#replace the columns putting data into main column
for (replacement_col_num in replacement_column_numbers) {
   na_rows <- is.na(somepolys[[main_column_number]])
  somepolys[[main_column_number]][na_rows] <-
somepolys[[replacement col num]][na_rows]
}
# delete purposeless columns 
somepolys <- somepolys[, -replacement column numbers]
# delete other purposelesscolumns
columns_to_remove <- c("ID.1", "ID.2", "ID.3", "ID.4", "ID.5", "ID.6", 
"ID.7")
# resave back to somepolys
somepolys <- somepolys[, !colnames(somepolys) %in% columns to remove]
#rename avg column in somepolys to mean (repeat steps for sd and max)
somepolys <- somepolys %>%
  rename(mean avg b1 landunits = avg)#join mean, sd and max data
somepolysleftjoin <- left_join(somepolys, select(somepolysd, 
sd avg b1 landunits, ID), by = "ID")
somepolysleftjoin <- left_join(somepolysleftjoin, select(somepolymax,
```

```
max avg b1 landunits, ID), by = "ID")b1 landunits avg <- somepolysleftjoin
```

```
#save data frame for each lidar metric to join 
save(b1 landunits avg,file="dataframes/b1 landunits avg.rds")
```
#this process should be looped for all 8 capture zones and any multipolygon boundaries

```
#load each spatial data frame (vector data)
load("dataframes/b1 landunits avg.rds")
load("dataframes/b1 landunits cov.rds")
load("dataframes/b1_landunits_p95.rds")
```

```
load("dataframes/b1_landunits_sd.rds")
load("dataframes/b1_landunits_skew.rds")
load("dataframes/b1_landunits_structural_index.rds")
```
#join each spatial data frame

```
b1 landunits <- left join(b1 landunits avg, select(b1 landunits_cov,
mean cov b1 landunits, sd cov b1 landunits, max cov b1 landunits, ID), by =
"ID")
b1 landunits <- left join(b1 landunits, select(b1 landunits p95,
mean p95 b1 landunits, sd p95 b1 landunits, max p95 b1 landunits, ID), by =
"ID")
b1_landunits <- left_join(b1_landunits, select(b1_landunits_sd, 
mean sd b1 landunits, sd sd b1 landunits, max sd b1 landunits, ID), by =
"ID")
b1_landunits <- left_join(b1_landunits, select(b1_landunits_skew, 
mean_skew_b1_landunits, sd_skew_b1_landunits, max_skew_b1_landunits, ID),
by = "ID")b1 landunits <- left join(b1 landunits,
select(b1_landunits_structural_index, mean_focal_sum_b1_landunits, 
sd_focal_sum_b1_landunits, max_focal_sum_b1_landunits, ID), by = "ID")
```
#identify which boundary data is from (useful for when all data is joined) b1_landunits\$b1 <- 1

#reasign data "spatial" class

b1 landunits \leftarrow b1 landunits %>% st as sf()

#save data for all boundary join save(b1_landunits,file="dataframes/b1_landunits.rds")

#load all boundary data

```
load("dataframes/b1_landunits.rds")
load("dataframes/b2_harvestplanareagross.rds")
load("dataframes/b3_patches.rds")
load("dataframes/b4_whc.rds")
load("dataframes/b5_trc.rds")
load("dataframes/b6_treecoastal.rds")
load("dataframes/b7_fesm.rds")
load("dataframes/b8 bna.rds")
load("dataframes/b9_harvesthistory.rds")
```
#join data together based on spatial shape and location (join by largest to resolve duplication of data)

bna_treecoastal <- st_join(b8_bna, b6_treecoastal, largest=TRUE) bna_treecoastal_fesm <- st_join(bna_treecoastal, b7_fesm, largest=TRUE) bna treecoastal fesm harvesthistory <- st join(bna treecoastal fesm, b9_harvesthistory, largest=TRUE) bna treecoastal fesm harvesthistory patches <st_join(bna_treecoastal_fesm_harvesthistory, b3_patches, largest=TRUE) bna_treecoastal_fesm_harvesthistory_patches_landunits < st join(bna treecoastal fesm harvesthistory patches, b1 landunits, largest=TRUE) bna_treecoastal_fesm_harvesthistory_patches_landunits_trc < st join(bna treecoastal fesm harvesthistory patches landunits, b5 trc, largest=TRUE) bna_treecoastal_fesm_harvesthistory_patches_landunits_trc_whc < st_join(bna_treecoastal_fesm_harvesthistory_patches_landunits_trc, b4_whc, largest=TRUE) b8_b6_b7_b9_b3_b1_b5_b4_b2 < st join(bna treecoastal fesm harvesthistory patches landunits trc whc, b2_harvestplanareagross, largest=TRUE)

#save data frame

save(b8 b6 b7 b9 b3 b1 b5 b4 b2, file="dataframes/b8_b6_b7_b9_b3_b1_b5_b4_b2.rds")

Appendix 3 –Spatial data files used in analysis

