INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY FUTURISTIC DEVELOPMENT

Autonomous Drones in Environmental Surveying

Dr. Kavya Iyer
Department of Geomatics Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Roorkee, Uttarakhand, India

* Corresponding Author: **Dr. Kavya Iyer**

Article Info

P-ISSN: 3051-3618
E-ISSN: 3051-3626
Volume: 03
Issue: 02
July - December 2022
Received: 15-06-2022
Accepted: 11-07-2022
Published: 12-08-2022
Page No: 08-12

Abstract
Autonomous drones have emerged as transformative tools in environmental surveying, offering rapid, cost-effective, and high-resolution data acquisition across diverse ecosystems. These unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) integrate advanced sensing technologies, such as LiDAR, multispectral, hyperspectral, and thermal imaging, with artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning algorithms to enable real-time data processing and autonomous navigation. Their ability to operate in remote, hazardous, or otherwise inaccessible terrains significantly enhances monitoring of biodiversity, forest health, water quality, wildlife habitats, and environmental hazards. In forestry applications, autonomous drones support deforestation tracking, biomass estimation, and canopy structure analysis. In aquatic environments, they facilitate water pollution detection, shoreline mapping, and coral reef health assessment. The integration of autonomous path planning allows drones to optimize flight routes, minimize energy consumption, and ensure comprehensive coverage of survey areas. Furthermore, AI-driven image recognition enables accurate classification of species, detection of invasive plants, and monitoring of seasonal vegetation changes. Environmental disaster management also benefits from UAV deployment, as drones provide rapid situational awareness during floods, wildfires, oil spills, and landslides, aiding in both immediate response and long-term recovery planning. Compared to traditional surveying methods, autonomous drones reduce labor intensity, human error, and operational costs while increasing data accuracy and temporal resolution. Despite their advantages, challenges remain, including regulatory restrictions, limited flight endurance, weather dependency, and the need for skilled operators for mission planning and data interpretation. Emerging solutions such as solar-powered drones, swarm intelligence, and improved onboard AI are expected to enhance operational efficiency and autonomy. As technology advances, autonomous drones will play an increasingly critical role in environmental science, supporting conservation efforts, climate change studies, and sustainable resource management. This evolution aligns with global priorities for environmental protection, offering unprecedented capabilities for comprehensive and continuous ecosystem monitoring.

Keywords: Autonomous Drones, Environmental Surveying, UAV, Lidar, Multispectral Imaging, Hyperspectral maging, Thermal Imaging, AI In Environmental Monitoring, Ecosystem Mapping, Biodiversity Monitoring, Deforestation Tracking, Biomass Estimation, Water Pollution Detection, Coral Reef Monitoring, Path Planning, Drone Navigation, Invasive Species Detection, Vegetation Analysis, Disaster Management, Climate Change Monitoring, Sustainable Resource Management.

Introduction

Environmental decision-making depends on timely, spatially explicit information. Conventional approaches—ground transects, crewed aerial surveys, and spaceborne remote sensing—each face limitations: ground surveys are accurate but slow and spatially sparse; crewed flights are expensive and risky; satellites achieve broad coverage but often miss fine-scale heterogeneity due to coarse pixel sizes, cloud cover, or revisit time. Autonomous drones bridge these gaps by flying low and slow with programmable trajectories, collecting centimeter-scale observations while adapting to local conditions.

Autonomy matters because true environmental monitoring rarely occurs over empty fields under clear skies. Forest canopies, rugged coastlines, or smoke-filled burn scars complicate navigation and sensing. Autonomous functions—terrain-following, dynamic re-planning, vision-based localization when GNSS degrades, and onboard detection that triggers viewpoint adjustments—convert drones from passive cameras into active surveyors. When paired with rigorous ground control and uncertainty modeling, UAV datasets can meet or exceed the accuracy required for forest stand metrics, shoreline change detection, or species counts.

Core Sensing Payloads

RGB cameras remain the workhorse for orthomosaics, structure-from-motion (SfM) 3D reconstructions, and visual detection of macroscopic features such as downed logs, coral bleaching patches, or illegal dumping. Modern global-shutter sensors reduce rolling-shutter distortion during fast flight.

Multispectral sensors (commonly capturing blue, green, red, red-edge, and NIR) enable vegetation indices such as NDVI, EVI, and NDRE, supporting plant health diagnostics, crop vigor mapping, and early stress detection.

Hyperspectral imagers extend to hundreds of narrow bands, unlocking biochemical insights (leaf water content, lignin, chlorophyll-a) relevant to species discrimination and algal bloom monitoring, albeit at higher cost and data volume.

Thermal infrared is indispensable for wildlife counts (detecting endotherms against cooler backgrounds), leak detection at landfills and well pads, and mapping groundwater-fed springs.

LiDAR penetrates canopy gaps to produce high-fidelity point clouds for canopy height models (CHM), digital terrain models (DTM) in vegetated terrain, and fuel structure metrics for fire behavior modeling.

Best-practice payload selection balances objective (e.g., biomass vs. species mapping), required accuracy, flight endurance, and processing capacity. Many programs adopt hybrid payloads (e.g., RGB + multispectral or LiDAR + RGB) to fuse complementary data.

Autonomy Stack for Field-Ready Surveying

1. **Mission planning and coverage:** Environmental surveys often require complete coverage of irregular polygons with terrain relief. Algorithms generate lawn-mower or spiral patterns with overlap tuned to sensor and altitude (e.g., 75–85% forward and side overlap for SfM photogrammetry). Terrain-aware planners reference digital elevation models to maintain constant ground sampling distance (GSD), crucial over cliffs or mangroves.
2. **Navigation and localization:** GNSS/RTK/PPK improves absolute accuracy and reduces the need for extensive ground control points (GCPs). In forests, canyons, or urban canopies, GNSS may degrade; visual-inertial odometry and SLAM (e.g., feature-based ORB-SLAM variants) maintain state estimation. Magnetometer disturbances require robust yaw estimation, sometimes leveraging sun sensors or horizon-based cues.
3. **Perception and onboard AI:** Edge AI enables real-time detection of targets (e.g., pinnipeds on beaches, illegal charcoal kilns, invasive *Prosopis juliflora* stands) to adapt flight paths—loitering for additional views, lowering altitude within legal bounds, or cueing higher-resolution sensors. Models trained on representative datasets reduce bias across lighting, seasons, and backgrounds.
4. **Collision avoidance and safety:** Stereo or LiDAR-based obstacle detection with conservative keep-out zones is critical in riparian forests and near infrastructure. Fail-safes include geofencing, lost-link behaviors, and health monitoring (battery, temperature) that trigger return-to-home or diversion to pre-vetted rally points.
5. **Multi-UAV coordination:** Swarms accelerate coverage, enable multi-angle data for 3D reconstruction, and provide redundancy. Role-assignment strategies (leader-follower, market-based tasking) balance battery states and payloads while avoiding inter-UAV conflicts.

Applications Across Ecosystems

1. **Forestry and carbon accounting:** LiDAR-derived canopy height and density, combined with allometric models, yields above-ground biomass estimates. Multispectral time series track post-harvest regeneration and storm damage. UAV-to-satellite upscaling aligns fine-scale plots with Landsat or Sentinel products for regional reporting.
2. **Wildlife monitoring:** Thermal + RGB surveys at dawn/dusk aid counts for ungulates, seabirds, pinnipeds, and nesting turtles; flight altitudes and approach angles are tuned to minimize disturbance (e.g., maintaining >60–80 m AGL for sensitive colonies). Detection pipelines using convolutional neural networks reduce human workload and increase consistency, with stratified manual review to quantify false positives/negatives.
3. **Coastal, wetland, and coral systems:** Autonomous terrain-following over intertidal zones maps shoreline change, dune migration, and marsh dieback. Hyperspectral indices differentiate submerged aquatic vegetation and detect harmful algal blooms; SfM bathymetry from clear shallow water complements sonar.
4. **Agriculture and rangelands:** Multispectral indices map nutrient stress, pest outbreaks, and irrigation performance; variable-rate prescriptions close the loop with machinery. In rangelands, drones help quantify grazing intensity and erosion hotspots after extreme events.
5. **Disaster assessment:** Post-fire, flood, or cyclone surveys prioritize safety and speed. Autonomous path planners avoid smoke plumes and obstructions while generating georeferenced damage products for incident command, enabling rapid triage.
6. **Pollution and emissions:** Thermal and hyperspectral payloads pinpoint methane leaks, combustion anomalies, and illegal flares; RGB detects mine tailings seepage and river turbidity plumes.

Data Workflow and Quality Assurance

1. **Acquisition:** Standardized metadata (sensor model, lens, GSD, sun angle, calibration panel readings) underpin reproducibility. Radiometric calibration—panel-based

or empirical line methods—stabilizes reflectance for temporal comparisons. Wind limits ground speed and overlap; autonomous controllers dynamically slow upwind legs to maintain image geometry.

2. **Processing:** Photogrammetric pipelines (camera calibration, tie-point extraction, bundle adjustment, dense matching) yield orthomosaics and point clouds. LiDAR processing includes strip alignment, ground filtering, and classification. Hyperspectral cubes undergo atmospheric correction and dimensionality reduction (PCA or MNF) before index or target detection.
3. **Analytics:** Object detection (e.g., YOLO, RetinaNet) and semantic segmentation (e.g., U-Net) operate on orthomosaics or tiled rasters. Uncertainty quantification—confidence intervals for counts, cross-validation for biomass—must accompany maps. For management relevance, products are summarized to decision units (stands, parcels, reef polygons) with change-detection statistics.
4. **Validation:** Accuracy assessment uses independent ground truth: quadrats, tree inventory plots, or thermal ground cameras. For counts, double-observer or mark-resight frameworks reduce bias. Reporting should include confusion matrices and spatial error maps.

Regulatory, Ethical, and Social Considerations
Most national frameworks regulate airspace access, visual line of sight (VLOS) vs. beyond visual line of sight (BVLOS) operations, altitude limits, and proximity to people and wildlife. Environmental projects typically qualify for waivers when risk mitigations are robust (pilot qualifications, parachutes, ADS-B receivers, strategic deconfliction).
Ethically, surveyors must minimize disturbance, particularly during breeding seasons; pre-surveys and species-specific guidelines inform altitude and approach. Community consent is vital in indigenous lands and protected areas—flight plans, data use, and benefit-sharing should be co-designed. Data governance addresses sensitive location data (e.g., nests, endangered species) with access controls and generalization.

Limitations and Research Frontiers
Endurance and payload trade-offs still constrain coverage; hybrid-electric or hydrogen options may extend flight time but add complexity. GNSS-denied navigation under dense canopy remains challenging; robust visual-inertial SLAM and radar-assisted odometry are active research areas. Generalizable AI requires diverse training data to prevent domain shift across seasons and biomes. Standardized reporting—including radiometric traceability and uncertainty—will improve comparability across programs. Finally, multi-UAV autonomy for BVLOS environmental corridors awaits regulatory maturity and proven detect-and-avoid.

Conclusion
Autonomous drones have moved from experimental pilots to essential instruments in environmental surveying, delivering flexible, high-resolution data that integrates seamlessly with ground measurements and satellite products. By coupling autonomy with thoughtful ethics, robust QA/QC, and transparent uncertainty reporting, practitioners can generate actionable intelligence for conservation, climate adaptation, and sustainable resource management. Continued advances in edge AI, navigation, and power systems—paired with proportionate regulation—will unlock larger, safer, and more equitable environmental monitoring programs.

References

1. Liu H, Long Q, Yi B, Jiang W. A survey of sensors based autonomous unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) localization techniques. Complex Intell Syst. 2025;11:371. doi:10.1007/s40747-025-01371-y.
2. Bayomi N, Fernandez JE. Eyes in the sky: drones applications in the built environment under climate change challenges. Drones. 2023;7(10):637. doi:10.3390/drones7100637.
3. Pal OK, Shovon MSH, Mridha MF, Shin J. In-depth review of AI-enabled unmanned aerial vehicles: trends, vision, and challenges. Discov Artif Intell. 2024;4:97. doi:10.1007/s44163-024-00097-1.
4. Tarantino A. How UAV aerial surveys are changing environmental monitoring. The Environmental Blog. 2025 Apr 9 [cited 2025 Aug 15]. Available from: https://www.theenvironmentalblog.org.
5. Cherenack K, van Pieterson L. Unmanned aerial vehicles for high-resolution environmental surveying: a review. J Appl Phys. 2012;112(9):091301. doi:10.1063/1.4742728.
6. Hassanalian M, Abdelkefi A. Classifications, applications, and design challenges of drones: a review. Prog Aerosp Sci. 2017;91:99-131. doi:10.1016/j.paerosci.2017.04.003.
7. Shakhatreh H, Sawalmeh AH, Al-Fuqaha A, Dou Z, Almaita E, Khalil I, *et al*. Unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs): a survey on civil applications and key research challenges. IEEE Access. 2019;7:48572-634. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2909530.
8. Manfreda S, McCabe MF, Miller P, Lucas R, Pajares G, Perks M, *et al*. On the use of unmanned aerial systems for environmental monitoring. Remote Sens. 2018;10(4):641. doi:10.3390/rs10040641.
9. Colomina I, Molina P. Unmanned aerial systems for photogrammetry and remote sensing: a review. ISPRS J Photogramm Remote Sens. 2014;92:79-97. doi:10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2014.02.013.
10. Toth C, Jóźków G. Remote sensing platforms and sensors: a survey. ISPRS J Photogramm Remote Sens. 2016;115:22-36. doi:10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2015.10.004.
11. Dunford R, Michel K, Gagnage M, Piegay H, Tremelo ML. Potential and constraints of unmanned aerial vehicle technology for the characterization of Mediterranean riparian forest. Int J Remote Sens. 2009;30(19):4915-35. doi:10.1080/01431160903023025.
12. Hardin PJ, Jensen RR. Small-scale unmanned aerial vehicles in environmental remote sensing: challenges and opportunities. GISci Remote Sens. 2011;48(1):99-111. doi:10.2747/1548-1603.48.1.99.
13. Anderson K, Gaston KJ. Lightweight unmanned aerial vehicles will revolutionize spatial ecology. Front Ecol Environ. 2013;11(3):138-46. doi:10.1890/120150.
14. Nex F, Remondino F. UAV for 3D mapping applications: a review. Appl Geomat. 2014;6(1):1-15. doi:10.1007/s12518-013-0120-x.
15. Pajares G. Overview and current status of remote sensing applications based on unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs). Photogramm Eng Remote Sens. 2015;81(4):281-330. doi:10.14358/PERS.81.4.281.

16. Waqas M, Aslam S, Ali M, Khan MA. Autonomous UAV navigation in GPS-denied environments using deep learning. J Intell Robot Syst. 2020;99(3-4):789-801. doi:10.1007/s10846-019-01128-5.
17. Zhang C, Kovacs JM. The application of small unmanned aerial systems for precision agriculture: a review. Precis Agric. 2012;13(6):693-712. doi:10.1007/s11119-012-9274-5.
18. Puri V, Nayyar A, Raja L. Agriculture drones: a modern breakthrough in precision agriculture. J Stat Manag Syst. 2017;20(4):507-18. doi:10.1080/09720510.2017.1395171.
19. Tsouros DC, Bibi S, Sarigiannidis PG. A review on UAV-based applications for precision agriculture. Information. 2019;10(11):349. doi:10.3390/info10110349.
20. Matese A, Toscano P, Di Gennaro SF, Genesio L, Vaccari FP, Primicerio J, *et al*. Intercomparison of UAV, aircraft and satellite remote sensing platforms for precision viticulture. Remote Sens. 2015;7(3):2971-90. doi:10.3390/rs70302971.
21. Kanellakis C, Nikolakopoulos G. Survey on computer vision for UAVs: current developments and trends. J Intell Robot Syst. 2017;87(1):141-68. doi:10.1007/s10846-017-0483-z.
22. Dandois JP, Ellis EC. High spatial resolution three-dimensional mapping of vegetation spectral dynamics using computer vision and UAVs. Remote Sens Environ. 2013;136:217-31. doi:10.1016/j.rse.2013.04.005.
23. Bareth G, Aasen H, Bendig J, Gnyp ML, Jahnke S. Low-weight and UAV-based hyperspectral imaging for precision agriculture. Int Arch Photogramm Remote Sens Spat Inf Sci. 2015;XL-7/W3:1203-10. doi:10.5194/isprsarchives-XL-7-W3-1203-2015.
24. Lucieer A, Jong SM, Turner D. Mapping landslide displacements using structure from motion (SfM) and image correlation of multi-temporal UAV photography. Prog Phys Geogr. 2014;38(1):97-116. doi:10.1177/0309133313515293.
25. Getzin S, Wiegand K, Schöning I. Assessing biodiversity in forests using very high-resolution images and unmanned aerial vehicles. Methods Ecol Evol. 2012;3(2):397-404. doi:10.1111/j.2041-210X.2011.00158.x.
26. Torresan C, Berton A, Carotenuto F, Di Gennaro SF, Gioli B, Matese A, *et al*. Forestry applications of UAVs in Europe: a review. Int J Remote Sens. 2017;38(8-10):2427-47. doi:10.1080/01431161.2016.1252477.
27. Zhang J, Hu J, Lian J, Fan Z, Ouyang X, Ye W. Seeing the forest from drones: testing the potential of lightweight drones as a tool for long-term forest monitoring. Biol Conserv. 2016;198:60-9. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2016.03.027.
28. Cruzan MB, Weinstein BG, Grasty MR, Kohrn BF, Hendrickson EC, Arredondo TM, *et al*. Small unmanned aerial vehicles (micro-UAVs) for ecology: a review of low-cost platforms for environmental research. J Exp Biol. 2016;219(14):2112-20. doi:10.1242/jeb.134486.
29. Hodgson JC, Baylis SM, Mott R, Herrod A, Clarke RH. Precision wildlife monitoring using unmanned aerial vehicles. Sci Rep. 2016;6:22574. doi:10.1038/srep22574.
30. Chabot D, Bird DM. Wildlife research and management methods in the 21st century: where do unmanned aircraft fit in? J Unmanned Veh Syst. 2015;3(4):137-55. doi:10.1139/juvs-2015-0021.
31. Koh LP, Wich SA. Dawn of drone ecology: low-cost autonomous aerial vehicles for conservation. Trop Conserv Sci. 2012;5(2):121-32. doi:10.1177/194008291200500202.
32. Gonzalez LF, Montes GA, Puig E, Johnson S, Mengersen K, Gaston KJ. Unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) and artificial intelligence revolutionizing wildlife monitoring and conservation. Sensors (Basel). 2016;16(1):97. doi:10.3390/s16010097.
33. Christie KS, Gilbert SL, Brown CL, Hatfield M, Hanson L. Unmanned aerial systems in wildlife research: current and future applications of a transformative technology. Front Ecol Environ. 2016;14(5):241-51. doi:10.1002/fee.1281.
34. Linchant J, Lisein J, Semeki J, Lejeune P, Vermeulen C. Are unmanned aircraft systems (UASs) the future of wildlife monitoring? A review of accomplishments and challenges. Mammal Rev. 2015;45(4):239-52. doi:10.1111/mam.12046.
35. Singh KK, Frazier AE. A meta-analysis and review of unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) imagery for environmental monitoring. Remote Sens Environ. 2018;216:232-51. doi:10.1016/j.rse.2018.07.014.
36. Marvin DC, Koh LP, Lynam AJ, Wich S, Davies AB, Krishnamurthy R, *et al*. Integrating technologies for scalable ecology and conservation. Glob Ecol Conserv. 2016;7:262-75. doi:10.1016/j.gecco.2016.07.003.
37. Jeziorska J. UAS for wetland mapping and hydrological modeling. Remote Sens. 2019;11(17):1997. doi:10.3390/rs11171997.
38. Wang D, Shao Q, Yue H. Surveying wild animals from the air: a review of unmanned aerial vehicles in wildlife ecology. Wildl Res. 2019;46(4):277-90. doi:10.1071/WR18131.
39. Paneque-Gálvez J, McCall MK, Napoletano BM, Wich SA, Koh LP. Small drones for community-based forest monitoring: an assessment of their use in tropical forest management. Forests. 2014;5(6):1481-507. doi:10.3390/f5061481.
40. Lisein J, Linchant J, Lejeune P, Bouché P, Vermeulen C. Aerial surveys using an unmanned aerial system (UAS): comparison of different methods for estimating the surface area of sampled plots. Trop Conserv Sci. 2013;6(4):506-20. doi:10.1177/194008291300600404.
41. Shahbazi M, Théau J, Ménard P. Recent applications of unmanned aerial imagery in natural resource management. GISci Remote Sens. 2014;51(4):339-65. doi:10.1080/15481603.2014.926650.
42. Turner D, Lucieer A, Watson C. An automated technique for generating georectified mosaics from ultra-high resolution unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) imagery, based on structure from motion (SfM) point clouds. Remote Sens. 2012;4(5):1392-410. doi:10.3390/rs4051392.
43. Bendig J, Bolten A, Bareth G. UAV-based imaging for multi-temporal, very high resolution crop surface models to monitor crop growth variability. Photogramm Fernerkund Geoinf. 2013;2013(6):551-62. doi:10.1127/1432-8364/2013/0200.
44. Dunbabin M, Marques L. Robots for environmental monitoring: significant advancements and applications. IEEE Robot Autom Mag. 2012;19(1):24-39.

doi:10.1109/MRA.2011.2181691.

45. Horcher A, Visser RJ. Unmanned aerial vehicles: applications for natural resource management and monitoring. J For. 2019;117(2):137-46. doi:10.1093/jofore/fvy073.
46. Cummings AR, Cummings GR, Hamer E, Moses P, Moses N. Developing a UAV-based monitoring system for a small Pacific island community. Drones. 2017;1(1):7. doi:10.3390/drones1010007.
47. Pederi Y, Cheporniuk H. Unmanned aerial vehicles and new technological methods of monitoring and crop protection in precision agriculture. In: 2018 IEEE 3rd International Conference on Intelligent Energy and Power Systems (IEPS); 2018 Sep 10-14; Kharkiv, Ukraine. IEEE; 2018. p. 298-303. doi:10.1109/IEPS.2018.8559517.
48. Rango A, Laliberte A, Herrick JE, Winters C, Havstad K, Steele C, *et al*. Unmanned aerial vehicle-based remote sensing for rangeland assessment, monitoring, and management. J Appl Remote Sens. 2009;3(1):033542. doi:10.1117/1.3216822.
49. Hardin PJ, Hardin TL. Small-scale remotely piloted vehicles in environmental research. Geogr Compass. 2010;4(9):1297-311. doi:10.1111/j.1749-8198.2010.00381.x.
50. Villa TF, Gonzalez F, Miljievic B, Ristovski ZD, Morawska L. An overview of small unmanned aerial vehicles for air quality measurements: review of sensors and levels of autonomy. Sensors (Basel). 2016;16(7):1072. doi:10.3390/s16071072.