

# LIDAR Accuracy Assessment Report—Rockingham County

## Rockingham County, Cape Fear Basin

The preliminary checkpoint spreadsheets were received from NCGS on June 18, 2002. 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	18.3	24	All	
<b>95</b>	<b>11.3</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>25</b>
17	15.2	4	Grass	
17	9.2	4	Weeds/Crop	
12	12.8	3	Scrub	
33	8.8	8	Forest	
17	12.0	4	Built-up	

The LIDAR data for Rockingham County, Cape Fear Basin meets the specification as per the RMSE criteria of 25 cm.

All figures represent the data with the 95% data set. Based on the limited amount of checkpoints, the data is of good quality.

# LIDAR Accuracy Assessment Report—Rockingham 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—Rockingham 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				
-16.5	Grass	-0.1	Weeds/Crop	4.9	Forest
-3.0	Grass	-13.5	Scrub	7.6	Forest
4.2	Grass	4.9	Scrub	13.2	Forest
25.1	Grass	16.9	Scrub	-11.6	Built-up
-13.7	Weeds/Crop	-13.3	Forest	-10.1	Built-up
-11.3	Weeds/Crop	-12.6	Forest	3.5	Built-up
-4.9	Weeds/Crop	0.2	Forest	18.0	Built-up
		2.7	Forest		
		3.9	Forest		

Table 3 illustrates the overall statistics for the checkpoint data.

Table 3. Overall Descriptive Statistics								
	RMSE (cm)	Mean (cm)	Median (cm)	Skew (cm)	Std Dev (cm)	# of Points	Min (cm)	Max (cm)
<b>Total</b>	<b>11.3</b>	-0.2	0.2	0.4	11.6	23	-16.5	25.1
<b>Grass</b>	<b>15.2</b>	2.4	0.6	0.6	17.4	4	-16.5	25.1
<b>Weeds/Crop</b>	<b>9.2</b>	-7.5	-8.1	0.4	6.2	4	-13.7	-0.1
<b>Scrub</b>	<b>12.8</b>	2.8	4.9	-0.6	15.3	3	-13.5	16.9
<b>Forest</b>	<b>8.8</b>	0.8	3.3	-0.7	9.3	8	-13.3	13.2
<b>Built Up</b>	<b>12.0</b>	-0.1	-3.3	0.9	13.8	4	-11.6	18.0

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




Figure 3