

## LIDAR Accuracy Assessment Report—Greene County

---

### Greene County - Neuse Basin

The preliminary checkpoint spreadsheets were received from NCGS on November 20, 2001. Two spreadsheets were included which compared the independent QA/QC survey checkpoints with the interpolated LIDAR "Z" value as provided by the contractors. The spreadsheet summaries included:

1. All the checkpoints with the RMSE calculation for combined land cover
2. 95% of the checkpoints with the RMSE calculation (5% of points having the largest error removed)

All data was reviewed and further analyzed to assess the quality of the data. The review process examined the statistics for the combined land cover and the trends for each specific land cover type. The following graphs and figures illustrate the data quality as per the RMSE criteria.

Table 1 summarizes the RMSE using:

- 100% of the checkpoints
- 95% of the checkpoints
- Checkpoints categorized by land cover type

Table 1. RMSE by Land Class				
%	RMSE (cm)	# of Points	Land Class	RMSE Criteria (cm)
100	14.8	120	All	
<b>95</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>25</b>
18	10.1	21	Grass	
17	10.4	20	Weeds/Crop	
15	15.9	18	Scrub	
31	15.6	37	Forest	
15	9.0	18	Built-up	

The LIDAR data for Greene County, Neuse Basin meets the specification as per the RMSE criteria of 25 cm.

All figures represent the data with the 95% data set. The data is of good quality.

# LIDAR Accuracy Assessment Report—Greene County

Figure 1 illustrates the RMSE by specific land cover type.




Figure 1

Figure 2 illustrates the magnitude of the differences between the checkpoints and LIDAR data by specific land cover type and sorted from lowest to highest.




Figure 2

## LIDAR Accuracy Assessment Report—Greene County

Table 2 illustrates the Delta between the QA/QC survey checkpoints and that of the interpolated LIDAR.

Table 2. Elevation Delta					
Delta (cm)	Land Cover				
-21.2	Grass	4.4	Weeds/Crop	-8.8	Forest
-18.0	Grass	7.2	Weeds/Crop	-8.7	Forest
-16.4	Grass	11.9	Weeds/Crop	-7.8	Forest
-12.8	Grass	-27.4	Scrub	-7.1	Forest
-10.8	Grass	-25.6	Scrub	-7.0	Forest
-10.6	Grass	-25.2	Scrub	-6.9	Forest
-9.0	Grass	-22.0	Scrub	-4.3	Forest
-8.7	Grass	-18.8	Scrub	-1.9	Forest
-7.7	Grass	-18.7	Scrub	2.0	Forest
-6.6	Grass	-18.7	Scrub	3.4	Forest
-4.4	Grass	-17.8	Scrub	5.6	Forest
-4.0	Grass	-11.7	Scrub	6.2	Forest
-3.8	Grass	-11.1	Scrub	10.0	Forest
-3.7	Grass	-9.8	Scrub	10.2	Forest
-2.4	Grass	-6.8	Scrub	10.7	Forest
-2.0	Grass	-3.6	Scrub	13.1	Forest
-1.1	Grass	-1.1	Scrub	13.4	Forest
2.2	Grass	1.6	Scrub	27.4	Forest
3.8	Grass	3.6	Scrub	-13.9	Built-up
5.7	Grass	5.3	Scrub	-10.4	Built-up
17.9	Grass	14.3	Scrub	-8.7	Built-up
-20.2	Weeds/Crop	-26.9	Forest	-4.8	Built-up
-19.1	Weeds/Crop	-26.4	Forest	-2.7	Built-up
-17.3	Weeds/Crop	-26.1	Forest	-1.9	Built-up
-15.3	Weeds/Crop	-28.1	Forest	1.0	Built-up
-13.7	Weeds/Crop	-26.0	Forest	1.0	Built-up
-13.2	Weeds/Crop	-22.2	Forest	4.0	Built-up
-8.8	Weeds/Crop	-21.4	Forest	4.1	Built-up
-7.5	Weeds/Crop	-21.3	Forest	5.5	Built-up
-7.5	Weeds/Crop	-20.9	Forest	6.1	Built-up
-5.4	Weeds/Crop	-18.3	Forest	8.4	Built-up
-4.2	Weeds/Crop	-18.0	Forest	10.0	Built-up
-4.2	Weeds/Crop	-13.5	Forest	11.3	Built-up
-3.5	Weeds/Crop	-12.3	Forest	12.2	Built-up
-1.8	Weeds/Crop	-12.2	Forest	12.2	Built-up
0.0	Weeds/Crop	-11.3	Forest	18.8	Built-up
3.3	Weeds/Crop	-10.0	Forest		
4.1	Weeds/Crop	-10.0	Forest		
		-9.3	Forest		

## LIDAR Accuracy Assessment Report—Greene County

Table 3 illustrates the overall statistics for the checkpoint data.

<b>Table 3. Overall Descriptive Statistics</b>								
	<b>RMSE (cm)</b>	<b>Mean (cm)</b>	<b>Median (cm)</b>	<b>Skew</b>	<b>Std Dev (cm)</b>	<b># of Points</b>	<b>Min (cm)</b>	<b>Max (cm)</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>-5.8</b>	<b>-6.9</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>-28.1</b>	<b>27.4</b>
<b>Grass</b>	<b>10.1</b>	<b>-5.4</b>	<b>-4.4</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>8.7</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>-21.2</b>	<b>17.9</b>
<b>Weeds/Crop</b>	<b>10.4</b>	<b>-5.5</b>	<b>-4.8</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>-20.2</b>	<b>11.9</b>
<b>Scrub</b>	<b>15.9</b>	<b>-10.8</b>	<b>-11.4</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>-27.4</b>	<b>14.3</b>
<b>Forest</b>	<b>15.6</b>	<b>-8.0</b>	<b>-9.3</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>13.5</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>-28.1</b>	<b>27.4</b>
<b>Built-up</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>-0.3</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>-13.9</b>	<b>18.8</b>

Figure 3 illustrates a histogram of the associated delta errors between the data checkpoints and the interpolated TIN values.




Figure 3