

# LIDAR Accuracy Assessment Report—Washington County

---

## Washington County, Pasquotank River Basin

The preliminary checkpoint spreadsheets were received from NCGS on February 8, 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	15.6	122	All	
<b>95</b>	<b>12.3</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>25</b>
16	10.2	20	Grass	
16	9.7	19	Weeds/Crop	
16	14.2	20	Scrub	
30	13.1	37	Forest	
16	13.1	20	Built-up	

The LIDAR data for Washington County, Pasquotank 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—Washington 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—Washington County

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

<b>Table 2. Elevation Delta</b>			
<b>Delta (cm)</b>	<b>Land Cover</b>		
-24.3	Grass	12.9	Weeds/Crop
-21.9	Grass	-29.8	Scrub
-18.5	Grass	-29.2	Scrub
-11.8	Grass	-22.7	Scrub
-11.4	Grass	-20.2	Scrub
-8.8	Grass	-16.9	Scrub
-8.6	Grass	-15.4	Scrub
-4.0	Grass	-14.6	Scrub
-2.7	Grass	-14.6	Scrub
-1.6	Grass	-10.6	Scrub
-0.9	Grass	-8.6	Scrub
-0.3	Grass	-8.4	Scrub
-0.2	Grass	-7.2	Scrub
0.9	Grass	-7.2	Scrub
1.7	Grass	-6.4	Scrub
4.0	Grass	-3.2	Scrub
4.9	Grass	-1.9	Scrub
5.6	Grass	-1.6	Scrub
7.8	Grass	-1.2	Scrub
8.3	Grass	-0.9	Scrub
-20.8	Weeds/Crop	0.6	Scrub
-18.4	Weeds/Crop	-32.6	Forest
-11.9	Weeds/Crop	-32.1	Forest
-11.1	Weeds/Crop	-26.8	Forest
-11.0	Weeds/Crop	-19.5	Forest
-10.2	Weeds/Crop	-17.7	Forest
-10.0	Weeds/Crop	-16.8	Forest
-6.2	Weeds/Crop	-15.7	Forest
-4.2	Weeds/Crop	-13.6	Forest
-3.3	Weeds/Crop	-12.7	Forest
-2.9	Weeds/Crop	-12.7	Forest
-2.8	Weeds/Crop	-11.8	Forest
-2.2	Weeds/Crop	-11.1	Forest
-2.1	Weeds/Crop	-10.2	Forest
0.6	Weeds/Crop	-10.0	Forest
6.6	Weeds/Crop	-8.9	Forest
7.3	Weeds/Crop	-8.5	Forest
7.8	Weeds/Crop	-7.6	Forest
		-5.8	Forest
		-4.4	Forest
		-4.1	Forest
		0.7	Forest
		0.8	Forest
		0.9	Forest
		1.3	Forest
		1.4	Forest
		3.0	Forest
		5.9	Forest
		6.1	Forest
		6.6	Forest
		7.8	Forest
		8.0	Forest
		8.8	Forest
		9.6	Forest
		10.2	Forest
		10.5	Forest
		13.6	Forest
		15.0	Forest
		-17.2	Built-up
		-15.9	Built-up
		-8.2	Built-up
		-8.0	Built-up
		-7.9	Built-up
		-1.6	Built-up
		-1.5	Built-up
		2.9	Built-up
		3.9	Built-up
		4.1	Built-up
		6.0	Built-up
		6.0	Built-up
		9.9	Built-up
		10.3	Built-up
		13.8	Built-up
		16.4	Built-up
		17.7	Built-up
		20.5	Built-up
		21.5	Built-up
		26.9	Built-up

## LIDAR Accuracy Assessment Report—Washington County

Table 3 illustrates the overall statistics for the checkpoint data.

Table 3. Overall Descriptive Statistics								
	RMSE (cm)	Mean (cm)	Median (cm)	Skew	Std Dev (cm)	# of Points	Min (cm)	Max (cm)
<b>Total</b>	<b>12.3</b>	-3.9	-3.0	-0.1	11.7	116	-32.6	26.9
<b>Grass</b>	<b>10.2</b>	-4.1	-1.2	-0.8	9.5	20	-24.3	8.3
<b>Weeds/Crop</b>	<b>9.7</b>	-4.3	-3.3	0.1	8.9	19	-20.8	12.9
<b>Scrub</b>	<b>14.2</b>	-11.0	-8.5	-0.7	9.2	20	-29.8	0.6
<b>Forest</b>	<b>13.1</b>	-4.7	-4.4	-0.5	12.4	37	-32.6	15.0
<b>Built-up</b>	<b>13.1</b>	5.0	5.0	-0.1	12.4	20	-17.2	26.9

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




Figure 3