



Dewberry Engineers Inc. | 813.225.1325
1000 North Ashley Drive, Suite 801 | 813.225.1385 fax
Tampa, FL 33602 | www.dewberry.com

FL Peninsular 2018 Lidar Project- St. Johns County

Report Produced for U.S. Geological Survey

USGS Contract: G16PC00020

Report Date: April 14, 2021

SUBMITTED BY:

Dewberry

1000 North Ashley Drive Suite 801

Tampa, FL 33602

813.225.1325

SUBMITTED TO:

U.S. Geological Survey

1400 Independence Road

Rolla, MO 65401

573.308.3810

4/14/2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Attachments | 1 |
| 1. Executive Summary | 2 |
| 1.1 Project Team | 2 |
| 1.2 Project Area | 2 |
| 1.3 Coordinate Reference System | 3 |
| 1.4 Project Deliverables | 4 |
| 2. Lidar Acquisition Report..... | 4 |
| 2.1 Lidar Acquisition Details | 4 |
| 2.2 Lidar System Parameters..... | 5 |
| 2.3 Acquisition Status Report and Flight Lines | 6 |
| 2.4 Acquisition Static Control | 6 |
| 2.5 Airborne Kinematic Control | 6 |
| 2.6 Generation and Calibration of Raw Lidar Data | 7 |
| 2.6.1 Boresight and Relative accuracy | 8 |
| 2.7 Final Calibration Verification | 9 |
| 3. Lidar Production & Qualitative Assessment..... | 14 |
| 3.1 Initial Processing | 14 |
| 3.1.1 Post Calibration Lidar Review | 14 |
| 3.2 Data Classification and Editing | 16 |
| 3.2.1 Qualitative Review | 17 |
| 3.2.2 Formatting Review | 21 |
| 4. Breakline Production & Qualitative Assessment | 22 |
| 4.1 Breakline Production Methodology | 22 |
| 4.1.1 Breakline Collection Requirements..... | 22 |
| 4.2 Breakline Qualitative Assessment..... | 24 |
| 5. DEM Production & Qualitative Assessment | 25 |
| 5.1 DEM Production Methodology | 25 |
| 5.2 DEM Qualitative Assessment..... | 25 |
| 6. Derivative Lidar Products | 27 |
| 6.1 Interswath Raster | 27 |
| 6.2 Interswath and Intraswath Polygons | 27 |
| 6.2.1 Interswath Accuracy..... | 27 |

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix A: GPS Processing Reports

4/14/2021

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The primary purpose of this project was to develop a consistent and accurate surface elevation dataset derived from high-accuracy light detection and ranging (lidar) technology for the FL Peninsular 2018 Lidar Project- St. Johns County project area.

Lidar data were processed and classified according to project specifications. Detailed breaklines and bare-earth Digital Elevation Models were produced for the project area. Project components were formatted based on a tile grid with each tile covering an area 5,000 ft by 5,000 ft. A total of 39,185 tiles will be produced for the project, providing approximately 34,911 sq. miles of coverage. A total of 844 tiles were produced for St. Johns County, providing approximately 756 sq. miles of coverage.

1.1 Project Team

Dewberry served as the prime contractor for the project. Woolpert was responsible for LAS classification, all lidar products, breakline production, and digital elevation model (DEM) production. Dewberry was responsible for project management and quality assurance.

Woolpert completed the ground survey for the project and delivered surveyed checkpoints. The task was to acquire surveyed checkpoints for the project to use in independent testing of the vertical accuracy of the lidar-derived surface model and to acquire surveyed ground control points for use in calibration activities. The GPS base station coordinates used during lidar data acquisition were verified.

Woolpert and Quantum Spatial completed lidar data acquisition and data calibration for the project area.

1.2 Project Area

The block area is shown in figure 1. St. Johns County contains 844 5,000 ft by 5,000 ft tiles. The project tile grid contains 39,185 5,000 ft by 5,000 ft tiles.

4/14/2021

FL Peninsular- St Johns County




Figure 1. Project map and tile grid.

1.3 Coordinate Reference System

Data produced for the project are delivered in the following spatial reference system:

- Horizontal Datum:** North American Datum of 1983 with the 2011 Adjustment (NAD 83 (2011))
- Vertical Datum:** North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD88)
- Geoid Model:** Geoid12B
- Coordinate System:** FL State Plane Zone East

4/14/2021

Horizontal Units: U.S. Survey Feet
Vertical Units: U.S. Survey Feet

1.4 Project Deliverables

The deliverables for the block are as follows:

1. Project Extents (Esri SHP)
2. Calibration Points (coordinates, Esri shapefile)
3. Classified Point Cloud (tiled LAS)
4. Independent Survey Checkpoint Data (report, photos, coordinates, Esri shapefiles)
5. Intensity Images (tiled, 8-bit gray scale, GeoTIFF format)
6. Breakline Data (file GDB)
7. Bare Earth Surface (tiled raster DEM, IMG format)
8. Interswath Raster
9. DZ Orthos
10. Interswath Polygons
11. Intraswath Polygons
12. Metadata (XML)
13. Block Report

2. LIDAR ACQUISITION REPORT- WOOLPERT

Dewberry elected to subcontract the lidar acquisition and calibration activities to Woolpert. Woolpert was responsible for providing lidar acquisition, calibration, and delivery of lidar data files.

The lidar aerial acquisition for St. Johns County was conducted between November 30, 2018 to March 24, 2019.

2.1 Lidar Acquisition Details

Woolpert planned 580 passes for the project area as a series of parallel flight lines with cross flight lines for the purposes of quality control. The flight plan included zigzag flight line collection as a result of the inherent IMU drift associated with all IMU systems. In order to reduce any margin for error in the flight plan, Woolpert followed FEMA's Appendix A "guidelines" for flight planning and, at a minimum, includes the following criteria:

- A digital flight line layout using Leica Mission Pro flight design software for direct integration into the aircraft flight navigation system;
- Planned flight lines, flight line numbers, and coverage area;
- Lidar coverage extended by a predetermined margin beyond all project borders to ensure necessary over-edge coverage appropriate for specific task order deliverables;
- Investigation of local restrictions related to air space and any controlled areas so that required permissions can be obtained in a timely manner with respect to project schedule; and
- Filed flight plans as required by local Air Traffic Control (ATC) prior to each mission.

4/14/2021

Woolpert monitored weather and atmospheric conditions and conducted lidar missions only when no conditions existed below the sensor that would affect the collection of data. Good lidar collection conditions include leaf-off for hardwoods and no snow, rain, fog, smoke, mist, or low clouds. Lidar systems are active sensors that do not require active light, thus allowing missions to be conducted during night hours if weather restrictions do not prevent collection. Woolpert accessed reliable weather sites and indicators (webcams) to establish the highest probability for successful data acquisition.

Within 72 hours prior to the planned day(s) of acquisition, Woolpert closely monitored the weather, checking all sources for forecasts at least twice daily. As soon as weather conditions were conducive to acquisition, aircraft mobilized to the project site to begin data collection. Once on site, the acquisition team took responsibility for weather analysis.

2.2 Lidar System Parameters

Woolpert operated a Cessna 404 Titan (Tail # N404CP) and a Reims 406 (Tail#N406SD) outfitted with a Leica Terrain Mapper lidar system during data collection. Table 1 details the lidar system parameters used during acquisition for this project.

Table 1. Woolpert lidar system parameters.

| Parameter | Value |
|---|----------------------|
| System | Leica Terrain Mapper |
| Altitude (m above ground level) | 2438 |
| Nominal flight speed (kts) | 140 |
| Scanner pulse rate (kHz) | 30 |
| Scan frequency (Hz) | 150 |
| Pulse duration of the scanner (ns) | 2.5 |
| Pulse width of the scanner (m) | 0.57 |
| Central wavelength of the sensor laser (nm) | 1064 |
| Multiple pulses in the air | Yes |
| Beam divergence (mrad) | 0.25 |
| Swath width (m) | 1140 |
| Nominal swath width on the ground (m) | 1140 |
| Swath overlap (%) | 27 |
| Total sensor scan angle (degrees) | 40 |
| Computed down track spacing per beam (m) | 0.43 |
| Computed cross track Spacing per beam (m) | 0.42 |
| Nominal pulse spacing (NPS) (single swath) (m) | 0.31 |
| Nominal Pulse Density (NPD) (single swath) (points per sq m) | 10.1 |
| Aggregate NPS (m) (if NPS was designed to be met through single coverage, ANPS and NPS will be equal) | 0.31 |
| Aggregate NPD (m) (if NPD was designed to be met through single coverage, ANPD and NPD will be equal) | 10.1 |

4/14/2021

| | |
|-------------------------------------|----|
| Maximum Number of Returns per Pulse | 15 |
|-------------------------------------|----|

2.3 Acquisition Status Report and Flight Lines

Upon notification to proceed, the flight crew loaded the flight plans and validated the flight parameters. The acquisition manager contacted air traffic control and coordinated flight pattern requirements. Lidar acquisition began immediately upon notification that control base stations were in place. During flight operations, the flight crew monitored weather and atmospheric conditions. Lidar missions were flown only when no condition existed below the sensor that would affect the collection of data. The pilot constantly monitored the course, position, pitch, roll, and yaw of the aircraft. The sensor operator monitored the lidar sensor, the position dilution of precision (PDOP), and performed the first quality control review during acquisition. The flight crew reviewed weather and cloud locations. Any flight lines impacted by unfavorable conditions were marked as invalid and re-flown immediately or at an optimal time.

2.4 Acquisition Static Control

Woolpert utilized FPRN and USGS CORS for the FL Peninsular lidar project area. The coordinates of all base stations used are provided in table 2. All control and calibration points are also provided in shapefile format as part of is delivery.

Table 2. Base stations used to control lidar acquisition.

| Name | NAD83(2011) FL State Plane East, ft | | NAD83(2011), ft Ellipsoid Height |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|---|
| | Easting (X) | Northing (Y) | |
| MTNT_CORS | 686748.417 | 556914.051 | -61.69 |
| PBCH_CORS | 910743.623 | 914080.222 | -49.80 |
| OKCB_CORS | 703163.295 | 1065904.871 | -44.73 |
| NAPL_CORS | 401512.547 | 660475.390 | -56.89 |
| FMYR_CORS | 372945.191 | 821451.160 | -43.17 |
| CCV6_CORS | 802211.306 | 1500205.242 | -74.25 |
| ORMD_CORS | 621458.218 | 1804732.026 | -59.79 |
| FLWE_CORS | 626424.425 | 1492936.628 | -11.33 |
| FMYR_CORS_ARP | 373762.228 | 821445.635 | -43.56 |

2.5 Airborne Kinematic Control

Airborne GNSS data was processed using the Applanix POSPac MMS software suite and Novatel's GrafNav software. Flights were flown with a minimum of six satellites in view (13° above the horizon) and with a PDOP of better than four. Distances from at least one base station to aircraft were kept to a maximum of 40 km (25 miles). For all flights, the GNSS data can be classified as excellent, with GNSS residuals of 3 cm average or better but no larger than 10 cm being recorded.

GPS processing reports for each mission are included in the Appendix A attachment.

4/14/2021

2.6 Generation and Calibration of Raw Lidar Data

Availability and status of all required GPS and laser data were verified against field reports and any data inconsistencies were addressed.

Subsequently the mission points were output using Leica software initially with default values from Leica or the last mission calibrated for the system. The initial point generation for each mission calibration was verified within Microstation/TerraScan for calibration errors. If a calibration error greater than specification was observed, the appropriate roll, pitch and scanner scale corrections were calculated. The point data were then regenerated with the new calibration values and validated internally again to ensure that the errors were fully addressed.

Data collected by the lidar unit was reviewed for completeness, acceptable density, and to make sure all data were captured without errors or corrupted values. All GPS, aircraft trajectory, mission information, and ground control files were reviewed and logged. A supplementary coverage check was carried out (Figure 2) to ensure that there were no unreported gaps in data coverage.

4/14/2021




Figure 2. Lidar swath output showing complete coverage.

2.6.1 Boresight and Relative accuracy

The initial points for each mission calibration were inspected for flight line errors, flight line overlap, slivers or gaps in the data, point data minimums, or issues with the lidar unit or GPS. Roll, pitch and scanner scale were optimized during the calibration process until relative accuracy requirements were met.

4/14/2021

Relative accuracy and internal quality were checked using at least 3 regularly spaced QC blocks in which points from all lines were loaded and inspected. Vertical differences between ground surfaces of each line were displayed. Color scale was adjusted to flag errors that were not within project specifications. Cross sections were visually inspected across each block to validate point to point, flight line to flight line, and mission to mission agreement.

The following relative accuracy specifications were used for this project:

- ≤ 6 cm maximum difference within individual swaths (intra-swath); and
- ≤ 8 cm RMSDz between adjacent and overlapping swaths (inter-swath).

A different set of QC blocks were generated for final review after any necessary transformations were applied.

2.7 Final Calibration Verification

A preliminary RMSEz error check was performed by Woolpert at this stage of the project life cycle in the raw Lidar dataset against GNSS static and kinematic data and compared to RMSEz project specifications. The Lidar data was examined in non-vegetated, flat areas away from breaks. Lidar ground points for each flight line generated by an automatic classification routine were used. Prior to delivery to Dewberry, the elevation data was verified internally to ensure it met Non-Vegetated Vertical Accuracy (NVA) requirements (RMSEz ≤ 10 cm and Accuracy at the 95% confidence level ≤ 19.6 cm) when compared to kinematic GNSS checkpoints.

3. LIDAR ACQUISITION REPORT- QUANTUM SPATIAL

Dewberry elected to subcontract the lidar acquisition and calibration activities to Quantum Spatial. Quantum Spatial was responsible for providing lidar acquisition, calibration, and delivery of lidar data files.

The lidar aerial acquisition for St. Johns County was conducted between November 30, 2018 to March 24, 2019.

3.1 Lidar Acquisition Details

Quantum Spatial planned 720 passes for passes for the project area as a series of parallel flight lines with cross flight lines for the purposes of quality control. The flight plan included zigzag flight line collection as a result of the inherent IMU drift associated with all IMU systems. In order to reduce any margin for error in the flight plan, Quantum Spatial followed FEMA' s Appendix A "guidelines" for flight planning and, at a minimum, includes the following criteria:

- A digital flight line layout using Leica Mission Pro flight design software for direct integration into the aircraft flight navigation system;
- Planned flight lines, flight line numbers, and coverage area;
- Lidar coverage extended by a predetermined margin beyond all project borders to ensure necessary over-edge coverage appropriate for specific task order deliverables;
- Investigation of local restrictions related to air space and any controlled areas so that required permissions can be obtained in a timely manner with respect to project schedule; and
- Filed flight plans as required by local Air Traffic Control (ATC) prior to each mission.

4/14/2021

Quantum Spatial monitored weather and atmospheric conditions and conducted lidar missions only when no conditions existed below the sensor that would affect the collection of data. Good lidar collection conditions include leaf-off for hardwoods and no snow, rain, fog, smoke, mist, or low clouds. Lidar systems are active sensors that do not require active light, thus allowing missions to be conducted during night hours if weather restrictions do not prevent collection. Quantum Spatial accessed reliable weather sites and indicators (webcams) to establish the highest probability for successful data acquisition.

Within 72 hours prior to the planned day(s) of acquisition, Quantum Spatial closely monitored the weather, checking all sources for forecasts at least twice daily. As soon as weather conditions were conducive to acquisition, aircraft mobilized to the project site to begin data collection. Once on site, the acquisition team took responsibility for weather analysis.

3.2 Lidar System Parameters

Quantum Spatial operated three Cessna Grand Caravans (Tail # N704MD, N208NR, N604MD) and two Cessna T206 Turbo Stationair (Tail#N916WC, N917WC) outfitted with Leica ALS80 lidar systems during data collection. Table 3 details the lidar system parameters used during acquisition for this project.

Table 3. Quantum Spatial lidar system parameters.

| Parameter | Value |
|---|-------------|
| System | Leica ALS80 |
| Altitude (m above ground level) | 1400 |
| Nominal flight speed (kts) | 150 |
| Scanner pulse rate (kHz) | 586 |
| Scan frequency (Hz) | 52 |
| Pulse duration of the scanner (ns) | 2.5 |
| Pulse width of the scanner (m) | 0.31 |
| Central wavelength of the sensor laser (nm) | 1064 |
| Multiple pulses in the air | Yes |
| Beam divergence (mrad) | 0.22 |
| Swath width (m) | 1019 |
| Nominal swath width on the ground (m) | 1018 |
| Swath overlap (%) | 60 |
| Total sensor scan angle (degrees) | 40 |
| Computed down track spacing per beam (m) | 0.74 |
| Computed cross track Spacing per beam (m) | 0.53 |
| Nominal pulse spacing (NPS) (single swath) (m) | 0.316 |
| Nominal Pulse Density (NPD) (single swath) (points per sq m) | 10 |
| Aggregate NPS (m) (if NPS was designed to be met through single coverage, ANPS and NPS will be equal) | 0.309 |
| Aggregate NPD (m) (if NPD was designed to be met through single coverage, ANPD and NPD will be equal) | 10.47 |

4/14/2021

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Maximum Number of Returns per Pulse | 7 |
|-------------------------------------|---|

3.3 Acquisition Status Report and Flight Lines

Upon notification to proceed, the flight crew loaded the flight plans and validated the flight parameters. The acquisition manager contacted air traffic control and coordinated flight pattern requirements. Lidar acquisition began immediately upon notification that control base stations were in place. During flight operations, the flight crew monitored weather and atmospheric conditions. Lidar missions were flown only when no condition existed below the sensor that would affect the collection of data. The pilot constantly monitored the course, position, pitch, roll, and yaw of the aircraft. The sensor operator monitored the lidar sensor, the position dilution of precision (PDOP), and performed the first quality control review during acquisition. The flight crew reviewed weather and cloud locations. Any flight lines impacted by unfavorable conditions were marked as invalid and re-flown immediately or at an optimal time.

3.4 Acquisition Static Control

Quantum Spatial utilized FPRN and USGS CORS for the FL Peninsular lidar project area. The coordinates of all base stations used are provided in table 4. All control and calibration points are also provided in shapefile format as part of is delivery.

Table 4. Base stations used to control lidar acquisition.

| Name | NAD83(2011) FL State Plane East, ft | | NAD83(2011), ft | NAVD88 Geoid12B, ft |
|------|-------------------------------------|--------------|------------------|---------------------|
| | Easting (X) | Northing (Y) | Ellipsoid Height | Orthometric Height |
| PLTK | 437738.25 | 1938161.29 | -17.94 | 10.44 |
| DLND | 572080.63 | 1716876.59 | 0.28 | 28.38 |

| Name | NAD83(2011) FL State Plane North, ft | | NAD83(2011), ft | NAVD88 Geoid12B, ft |
|------|--------------------------------------|--------------|------------------|---------------------|
| | Easting (X) | Northing (Y) | Ellipsoid Height | Orthometric Height |
| GNVL | 2674388.15 | 256559.51 | 23.95 | 51.82 |

3.5 Airborne Kinematic Control

Airborne GNSS data was processed using the Applanix POSPac MMS software suite and Novatel's GrafNav software. Flights were flown with a minimum of six satellites in view (13° above the horizon) and with a PDOP of better than four. Distances from at least one base station to aircraft were kept to a maximum of 40 km (25 miles). For all flights, the GNSS data can be classified as excellent, with GNSS residuals of 3 cm average or better but no larger than 10 cm being recorded.

GPS processing reports for each mission are included in the Appendix A attachment.

4/14/2021

3.6 Generation and Calibration of Raw Lidar Data

Availability and status of all required GPS and laser data were verified against field reports and any data inconsistencies were addressed.

Subsequently the mission points were output using Leica software initially with default values from Leica or the last mission calibrated for the system. The initial point generation for each mission calibration was verified within Microstation/TerraScan for calibration errors. If a calibration error greater than specification was observed, the appropriate roll, pitch and scanner scale corrections were calculated. The point data were then regenerated with the new calibration values and validated internally again to ensure that the errors were fully addressed.

Data collected by the lidar unit was reviewed for completeness, acceptable density, and to make sure all data were captured without errors or corrupted values. All GPS, aircraft trajectory, mission information, and ground control files were reviewed and logged. A supplementary coverage check was carried out (Figure 3) to ensure that there were no unreported gaps in data coverage.

4/14/2021




Figure 3. Lidar swath output showing complete coverage.

3.6.1 Boresight and Relative accuracy

The initial points for each mission calibration were inspected for flight line errors, flight line overlap, slivers or gaps in the data, point data minimums, or issues with the lidar unit or GPS. Roll, pitch and scanner scale were optimized during the calibration process until relative accuracy requirements were met.

4/14/2021

Relative accuracy and internal quality were checked using at least 3 regularly spaced QC blocks in which points from all lines were loaded and inspected. Vertical differences between ground surfaces of each line were displayed. Color scale was adjusted to flag errors that were not within project specifications. Cross sections were visually inspected across each block to validate point to point, flight line to flight line, and mission to mission agreement.

The following relative accuracy specifications were used for this project:

- ≤ 6 cm maximum difference within individual swaths (intra-swath); and
- ≤ 8 cm RMSDz between adjacent and overlapping swaths (inter-swath).

A different set of QC blocks were generated for final review after any necessary transformations were applied.

3.7 Final Calibration Verification

A preliminary RMSEz error check was performed by Quantum Spatial at this stage of the project life cycle in the raw Lidar dataset against GNSS static and kinematic data and compared to RMSEz project specifications. The Lidar data was examined in non-vegetated, flat areas away from breaks. Lidar ground points for each flight line generated by an automatic classification routine were used. Prior to delivery to Dewberry, the elevation data was verified internally to ensure it met Non-Vegetated Vertical Accuracy (NVA) requirements (RMSEz ≤ 10 cm and Accuracy at the 95% confidence level ≤ 19.6 cm) when compared to kinematic GNSS checkpoints.

4. LIDAR PRODUCTION & QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT

4.1 Initial Processing

Following receipt of the calibrated swath data from the acquisition provider, Dewberry performed vertical accuracy validation of the swath data, inter-swath relative accuracy validation, intra-swath relative accuracy validation, verification of horizontal alignment between swaths, and confirmation of point density and spatial distribution. This initial assessment allowed Dewberry to determine whether the data was suitable for full-scale production.

4.1.1 Post Calibration Lidar Review

The table below identifies requirements verified by Dewberry prior to tiling the swath data, running initial ground macros, and starting manual classification.

Table 5 – Post calibration and initial processing data verification steps.

| Requirement | Description of Deliverables | Additional Comments |
|---|---|---------------------|
| Non-vegetated vertical accuracy (NVA) of the swath data meet required specifications of 19.6 cm at the 95% confidence level based on RMSEz (10 cm) x 1.96 | The swath NVA was tested and passed specifications. | None |

4/14/2021

| Requirement | Description of Deliverables | Additional Comments |
|--|---|---------------------|
| The NPD/NPS (or Aggregate NPD/Aggregate NPS) meets required specification of 8 ppsm or 0.35 m NPS. The NPD (ANPD) is calculated from first return points only. | The average calculated (A)NPD of this project is 8 ppsm. Density raster visualization also passed specifications. | None |
| Spatial Distribution requires 90% of the project grid, calculated with cell sizes of 2*NPS, to contain at least one lidar point. This is calculated from first return points only. | 98% of cells (2*NPS cell size) had at least 1 lidar point within the cell. | None |
| Within swath (Intra-swath or hard surface repeatability) relative accuracy must meet ≤ 6 cm maximum difference | Within swath relative accuracy passed specification. | None |
| Between swath (Inter-swath or swath overlap) relative accuracy must meet 8 cm RMSDz/16 cm maximum difference. These thresholds are tested in open, flat terrain. | Between swath relative accuracy passed specification, calculated from single return lidar points. | None |
| Horizontal Calibration-There should not be horizontal offsets (or vertical offsets) between overlapping swaths that would negatively impact the accuracy of the data or the overall usability of the data. Assessments made on rooftops or other hard planar surfaces where available. | Horizontal calibration met project requirements. | None |
| Ground Penetration-The missions were planned appropriately to meet project density requirements and achieve as much ground penetration beneath vegetation as possible | Ground penetration beneath vegetation was acceptable. | None |
| Sensor Anomalies-The sensor should perform as expected without anomalies that negatively impact the usability of the data, including issues such as excessive sensor noise and intensity gain or range-walk issues | No sensor anomalies were present. | None |
| Edge of Flight line bits-These fields must show a minimum value of 0 and maximum value of 1 for each swath acquired, regardless of which type of sensor is used | Edge of Flight line bits were populated correctly | None |

4/14/2021

| Requirement | Description of Deliverables | Additional Comments |
|---|--|---------------------|
| Scan Direction bits-These fields must show a minimum value of 0 and maximum value of 1 for each swath acquired with sensors using oscillating (back-and-forth) mirror scan mechanism. These fields should show a minimum and maximum of 0 for each swath acquired with Riegl sensors as these sensors use rotating mirrors. | Scan Direction bits were populated correctly | None |
| Swaths are in LAS v1.4 formatting | Swaths were in LAS v1.4 as required by the project. | None |
| All swaths must have File Source IDs assigned (these should equal the Point Source ID or the flight line number) | File Source IDs were correctly assigned | None |
| GPS timestamps must be in Adjusted GPS time format and Global Encoding field must also indicate Adjusted GPS timestamps | GPS timestamps were Adjusted GPS time and Global Encoding field were correctly set to 17 | None |
| Intensity values must be 16-bit, with values ranging between 0-65,535 | Intensity values were 16-bit | None |
| Point Source IDs must be populated and swath Point Source IDs should match the File Source IDs | Point Source IDs were assigned and match the File Source IDs | None |

4.2 Data Classification and Editing

Once the calibration, absolute swath vertical accuracy, and relative accuracy of the data were confirmed, Dewberry utilized proprietary and TerraScan software for processing. The acquired 3D laser point clouds were tiled according to the project tile grid using proprietary software. Once tiled, the laser points were classified using a proprietary routine in TerraScan. This routine classified any obvious low outliers in the dataset to class 7 and high outliers in the dataset to class 18. Points along flight line edges that were geometrically unusable were flagged as withheld and classified to a separate class so that they would be excluded from the initial ground algorithm. After points that could negatively affect the ground were removed from class 1, the ground layer was extracted from this remaining point cloud using an iterative surface model.

This surface model was generated using four main parameters: building size, iteration angle, iteration distance, and maximum terrain angle. The initial model was based on low points being selected by a "roaming window" with the assumption that these were the ground points. The size of this roaming window was determined by the building size parameter. The low points were triangulated and the remaining points were evaluated and subsequently added to the model if they met the iteration angle and distance constraints. This process was repeated until no additional points were added within iterations. Points that did not relate to classified ground within the maximum terrain angle were not captured by the initial model.

4/14/2021

After the initial automated ground routine, each tile was imported into TerraScan and a surface model was created to examine the ground classification. Dewberry analysts visually reviewed the ground surface model and corrected errors in the ground classification such as vegetation, buildings, and bridges that were present following the initial processing. Dewberry analysts employed 3D visualization techniques to view the point cloud at multiple angles and in profile to ensure that non-ground points were removed from the ground classification. Bridge decks were classified to class 17 and bridge saddle breaklines were used where necessary. After the ground classification corrections were completed, the dataset was processed through a water classification routine that utilized breaklines to automatically classify hydro features. The water classification routine selected ground points within the breakline polygons and automatically classified them as class 9, water. During this water classification routine, points that were within 1 NPS distance or less of the hydrographic feature boundaries were moved to class 20, ignored ground, to avoid hydro-flattening artifacts along the edges of hydro features.

The withheld bit was set on the withheld points that extend beyond the 200 m merged data buffer.

After manual classification, the LAS tiles were peer reviewed and then underwent a final independent QA/QC. After the final QA/QC and corrections, all headers, appropriate point data records, and variable length records, including spatial reference information, were updated and verified using proprietary Dewberry software.

4.2.1 Qualitative Review

Dewberry’s qualitative assessment of lidar point cloud data utilized a combination of statistical analyses and visual interpretation. Methods and products used in the assessment included profile- and map view-based point cloud review, pseudo image products (e.g., intensity orthoimages), TINs, DEMs, DSMs, and point density rasters. This assessment looked for incorrect classification and other errors sourced in the LAS data. Lidar data are peer reviewed, reviewed by task leads (senior level analysts), and verified by an independent QA/QC team at key points within the lidar workflow.

The following table describes Dewberry’s standard editing and review guidelines for specific types of features, land covers, and lidar characteristics.

Table 6 – Post calibration and initial processing data verification steps.

| Category | Editing Guideline | Additional Comments |
|---------------|--|---|
| No Data Voids | The SOW for the project defines unacceptable data voids as voids greater than 4 x ANPS ² , or 1.96 m ² , that are not related to water bodies or other areas of low near-infrared reflectivity and are not appropriately filled by data from an adjacent swath. The LAS files were used to produce density grids | No unacceptable voids were identified in this dataset |

4/14/2021

| Category | Editing Guideline | Additional Comments |
|----------------------|--|---------------------|
| | based on Class 2 (ground) points for review. | |
| Artifacts | Artifacts in the point cloud are typically caused by misclassification of points in vegetation or man-made structures as ground. Low-lying vegetation and buildings are difficult for automated grounding algorithms to differentiate and often must be manually removed from the ground class. Dewberry identified these features during lidar editing and reclassified them to Class 1 (unassigned). Artifacts up to 0.3 m above the true ground surface may have been left as Class 2 because they do not negatively impact the usability of the dataset. | None |
| Bridge Saddles | The DEM surface models are created from TINs or terrains. TIN and terrain models create continuous surfaces from the input points, interpolating surfaces beneath bridges where no lidar data was acquired. The surface model in these areas tend to be less detailed. Bridge saddles may be created where the surface interpolates between high and low ground points. Dewberry identifies problems arising from bridge removal and resolves them by reclassifying misclassified ground points to class 1 and/or adding bridge saddle breaklines where applicable due to interpolation. | None |
| Culverts and Bridges | It is Dewberry's standard operating procedure to leave culverts in the bare earth surface model and remove bridges from the model. In instances where it is difficult to determine whether the feature was a culvert or bridge, Dewberry errs on the side of culverts, especially if the feature is on a secondary or tertiary road. | None |

4/14/2021

| Category | Editing Guideline | Additional Comments |
|------------------------------|--|---|
| In-Ground Structures | In-ground structures typically occur on military bases and at facilities designed for munitions testing and storage. When present, Dewberry identifies these structures in the project and includes them in the ground classification. | No in-ground structures present in this dataset |
| Dirt Mounds | Irregularities in the natural ground, including dirt piles and boulders, are common and may be misinterpreted as artifacts that should be removed. To verify their inclusion in the ground class, Dewberry checked the features for any points above or below the surface that might indicate vegetation or lidar penetration and reviews ancillary layers in these locations as well. Whenever determined to be natural or ground features, Dewberry edits the features to class 2 (ground) | No dirt mounds or other irregularities in the natural ground were present in this dataset |
| Irrigated Agricultural Areas | Per project specifications, Dewberry collected all areas of standing water greater than or equal to 2 acres, including areas of standing water within agricultural areas and not within wetland or defined waterbody, hydrographic, or tidal boundaries. Areas of standing water that did not meet the 2 acre size criteria were not collected. | Standing water within agricultural areas not present in the data |
| Wetland/Marsh Areas | Vegetated areas within wetlands/marsh areas are not considered water bodies and are not hydroflattened in the final DEMs. However, it is sometimes difficult to determine true ground in low wet areas due to low reflectivity. In these areas, the lowest points available are used to represent ground, resulting in a sparse and variable ground surface. Open water within wetland/marsh areas greater than or equal to 2 acres is collected as a waterbody. | No marshes present in the data |
| Flight Line Ridges | Flight line ridges occur when there is a difference in elevation between adjacent flight lines or swaths. If ridges are | No flight line ridges are present in the data |

4/14/2021

| Category | Editing Guideline | Additional Comments |
|----------------------|--|--|
| | <p>visible in the final DEMs, Dewberry ensures that any ridges remaining after editing and QA/QC are within project relative accuracy specifications.</p> | |
| Temporal Changes | <p>If temporal differences are present in the dataset, the offsets are identified with a shapefile.</p> | <p>If temporal offsets are present in the data, the areas are outlined in the temporal.shp</p> |
| Low NIR Reflectivity | <p>Some materials, such as asphalt, tars, and other petroleum-based products, have low NIR reflectivity. Large-scale applications of these products, including roadways and roofing, may have diminished to absent lidar returns. USGS LBS allow for this characteristic of lidar but if low NIR reflectivity is causing voids in the final bare earth surface, these locations are identified with a shapefile.</p> | <p>No Low NIR Reflectivity is present in the data</p> |
| Laser Shadowing | <p>Shadows in the LAS can be caused when solid features like trees or buildings obstruct the lidar pulse, preventing data collection on one or more sides of these features. First return data is typically collected on the side of the feature facing toward the incident angle of transmission (toward the sensor), while the opposite side is not collected because the feature itself blocks the incoming laser pulses. Laser shadowing typically occurs in areas of single swath coverage because data is only collected from one direction. It can be more pronounced at the outer edges of the single coverage area where higher scanning angles correspond to more area obstructed by features. Building shadow in particular can be more pronounced in urban areas where structures are taller. Data are edited to the fullest extent possible within the point cloud. As long as data meet other project requirements (density, spatial</p> | <p>No Laser Shadowing is present in the data</p> |

4/14/2021

| Category | Editing Guideline | Additional Comments |
|----------|--|---------------------|
| | distribution, etc.), no additional action taken. | |

4.2.2 Formatting Review

After the final QA/QC was performed and all corrections were applied to the dataset, all lidar files were updated to the final format requirements and the final formatting, header information, point data records, and variable length records were verified using proprietary tools. The table below lists the primary lidar header fields that are updated and verified.

Table 7. Classified lidar formatting parameters

| Parameter | Project Specification | Pass/Fail |
|--|--|-----------|
| LAS Version | 1.4 | Pass |
| Point Data Record Format | 6 | Pass |
| Horizontal Coordinate Reference System | NAD83 (2011) FL State Plane Zone East in WKT format | Pass |
| Vertical Coordinate Reference System | NAVD88 (Geoid 12B), US ft in WKT format | Pass |
| Global Encoder Bit | 17 for adjusted GPS time | Pass |
| Time Stamp | Adjusted GPS time (unique timestamps) | Pass |
| System ID | Sensor used to acquire data | Pass |
| Multiple Returns | The sensor shall be able to collect multiple returns per pulse and the return numbers are recorded | Pass |
| Intensity | 16-bit intensity values recorded for each pulse | Pass |
| Classification | Class 1: Unclassified Class 2: Ground Class 6: Buildings Class 7: Low Noise Class 9: Water Class 17: Bridge Decks Class 18: High Noise Class 20: Ignored Ground | Pass |
| Withheld Points | Withheld bits set | Pass |
| Scan Angle | Recorded for each pulse | Pass |
| XYZ Coordinates | Recorded for each pulse | Pass |

4/14/2021

5. BREAKLINE PRODUCTION & QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT

5.1 Breakline Production Methodology

Breaklines were manually digitized within an Esri software environment, using full point cloud intensity imagery, bare earth terrains and DEMs, the lidar point cloud, and ancillary ortho imagery where appropriate.

When data characteristics are suitable, Dewberry may use eCognition software to generate initial, automated water polygons, which are then manually reviewed and refined where necessary.

Breakline features with static or semi-static elevations (ponds and lakes, bridge saddles, and soft feature breaklines) were converted to 3D breaklines within the Esri environment where breaklines were draped on terrains or the las point cloud. Subsequent processing was done on ponds/lakes to identify the minimum z-values within these features and re-applied that minimum elevation to all vertices of the breakline feature.

Linear hydrographic features show downhill flow and maintain monotonicity. These breaklines underwent conflation by using a combination of Esri and LP360 software. Centerlines were draped on terrains, enforced for monotonicity, and those elevations were then assigned to the bank lines for the final river/stream z-values.

Tidal breaklines may have been converted to 3D using either method, dependent on the variables within each dataset.

5.1.1 Breakline Collection Requirements

The table below outlines breakline collection requirements for this dataset.

Table 8. Breakline collection requirements

| Parameter | Project Specification | Additional Comments |
|-----------------------|--|---------------------|
| Ponds and Lakes | Breaklines are collected in all inland ponds and lakes ~2 acres or greater. These features are flat and level water bodies at a single elevation for each vertex along the bank. | None |
| Hydrographic Features | Breaklines are collected for all streams and rivers 8 ft nominal width or wider as dual line drains and single line drains for features <8 ft in nominal width but greater than 0.5 mi in length. The dual line drain features are flat and level bank to bank, gradient will follow the surrounding terrain and the water surface will be at or below the surrounding terrain. Streams/river channels will break at culvert locations | None |

4/14/2021

| | | |
|--------------------------|--|------|
| | however not at elevated bridge locations. | |
| Coastal Feature | Breaklines are collected as polygon features depicting water bodies such as oceans, seas, gulfs, bays, inlets, salt marshes, very large lakes, etc. Includes any significant water body that is affected by tidal variations. Tidal variations over the course of collection, and between different collections, can result in discontinuities along shorelines. This is considered normal and should be retained. Variations in water surface elevation resulting from tidal variations during collection should not be removed or adjusted. Features should be captured as a dual line with one line on each bank. Each vertex placed shall maintain vertical integrity. Parallel points on opposite banks of the tidal waters must be captured at the same elevation to ensure flatness of the water feature. The entire water surface edge is at or below the immediate surrounding terrain. | None |
| Islands | Donuts will exist where there are islands greater than 1 acre in size within a hydro feature. | None |
| Bridge Saddle Breaklines | Bridge Saddle Breaklines are collected where bridge abutments were interpolated after bridge removal causing saddle artifacts. | None |
| Soft Features | Soft Feature Breaklines are collected where additional enforcement of the modeled bare earth terrain was required, typically on hydrographic control structures or vertical waterfalls, due to large vertical elevation differences within a short linear distance on a hydrographic features. | None |
| Connectors | A CONNECTOR will be collected where a hydrographic feature is collected on either side of the road. | None |

4/14/2021

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | The connector must snap to the adjoining hydrological features. | |
|--|---|--|

5.2 Breakline Qualitative Assessment

Dewberry performed both manual and automated checks on the collected breaklines. Breaklines underwent peer reviews, breakline lead reviews (senior level analysts), and final reviews by an independent QA/QC team. The table below outlines high level steps verified for every breakline dataset.

Table 9 – Breakline verification steps.

| Parameter | Requirement | Pass/Fail |
|-----------------------------------|--|-----------|
| Collection | Collect breaklines according to project specifications using lidar-derived data, including intensity imagery, bare earth ground models, density models, slope models, and terrains. | Pass |
| Placement | Place the breakline inside or seaward of the shoreline by 1-2 x NPS in areas of heavy vegetation or where the exact shoreline is hard to delineate. | Pass |
| Completeness | Perform a completeness check, breakline variance check, and all automated checks on each block before designating that block complete. | Pass |
| Merged Dataset | Merge completed production blocks. Ensure correct horizontal and vertical snapping between all production blocks. Confirm correct horizontal placement of breaklines. | Pass |
| Merged Dataset Completeness Check | Check entire dataset for features that were not captured but that meet baseline specifications or other metrics for capture. Features should be collected consistently across tile boundaries. | Pass |
| Edge Match | Ensure breaklines are correctly edge-matched to adjoining datasets. Check completion type, attribute coding, and horizontal placement. | Pass |
| Vertical Consistency | Waterbodies shall maintain a constant elevation at all vertices Vertices should not have excessive min or max z-values when compared to adjacent vertices Intersecting features should maintain connectivity in X, Y, Z planes | Pass |

4/14/2021

| | | |
|----------------------|--|------|
| | Dual line streams shall have the same elevation at any given cross-section of the stream | |
| Vertical Variance | Using a terrain created from lidar ground (class 2, 8, and 20 as applicable) and water points (class 9) to compare breakline Z values to interpolated lidar elevations to ensure there are no unacceptable discrepancies. | Pass |
| Monotonicity | Dual line streams generally maintain a consistent down-hill flow and collected in the direction of flow – some natural exceptions are allowed | Pass |
| Topology | Features must not overlap or have gaps Features must not have unnecessary dangles or boundaries | Pass |
| Hydro-classification | The water classification routine selected ground points within the breakline polygons and automatically classified them as class 9, water. During this water classification routine, points that were within 1 NPS distance or less of the hydrographic feature boundaries were moved to class 20, ignored ground, to avoid hydroflattening artifacts along the edges of hydro features. | Pass |
| Hydro-flattening | Perform hydro-flattening and hydro-enforcement checks. Tidal waters should preserve as much ground as possible and can be non-monotonic. | Pass |

6. DEM PRODUCTION & QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT

6.1 DEM Production Methodology

Dewberry utilized LP360 to generate DEM products and both ArcGIS and Global Mapper for QA/QC.

The final classified lidar points in all bare earth classes were loaded into LP360 along with the final 3D breaklines and the project tile grid. A raster was generated from the lidar data with breaklines enforced and clipped to the project tile grid. The DEM was reviewed for any issues requiring corrections, including remaining lidar misclassifications, erroneous breakline elevations, incorrect or incomplete hydro-flattening or hydro-enforcement, and processing artifacts. The formatting of the DEM tiles was verified before the tiles were loaded into Global Mapper to ensure that there was no missing or corrupt data and that the DEMs matched seamlessly across tile boundaries. A final qualitative review was then conducted by an independent review department within Dewberry.

6.2 DEM Qualitative Assessment

Dewberry performed a comprehensive qualitative assessment of the bare earth DEM deliverables to ensure that all tiled DEM products were delivered with the proper extents, were free of processing artifacts, and

4/14/2021

contained the proper referencing information. Dewberry conducted the review in ArcGIS using a hillshade model of the full dataset with a partially transparent colored elevation model overlaid. The tiled DEMs were reviewed at a scale of 1:5,000 to look for artifacts caused by the DEM generation process and to verify correct and complete hydro-flattening and hydro-enforcement. Upon correction of any outstanding issues, the DEM data was loaded into Global Mapper for its second review and to verify corrections.

The table below outlines high level steps verified for every DEM dataset.

Table 10 – DEM verification steps.

| Parameter | Requirement | Pass/Fail |
|---|---|-----------|
| Digital Elevation Model (DEM) of bare-earth w/ breaklines | DEM of bare-earth terrain surface (2.5') is created from lidar ground points and breaklines. DEMs are tiled without overlaps or gaps, show no edge artifact or mismatch, DEM deliverables are .img format | Pass |
| DEM Compression | DEM's are not compressed | Pass |
| DEM NoData | Areas outside survey boundary are coded as NoData. Internal voids (e.g., open water areas) are coded as NoData | Pass |
| Hydro-flattening | Ensure DEMs were hydro-flattened or hydro-enforced as required by project specifications | Pass |
| Monotonicity | Verify monotonicity of all linear hydrographic features | Pass |
| Breakline Elevations | Ensure adherence of breaklines to bare-earth surface elevations, i.e., no floating or digging hydrographic feature | Pass |
| Bridge Removal | Verify removal of bridges from bare-earth DEMs and no saddles present | Pass |
| DEM Artifacts | Correct any issues in the lidar classification that were visually expressed in the DEMs. Reprocess the DEMs following lidar corrections. | Pass |
| DEM Tiles | Split the DEMs into tiles according to the project tiling scheme | Pass |
| DEM Formatting | Verify all properties of the tiled DEMs, including coordinate reference system information, cell size, cell extents, and that compression is not applied to the tiled DEMs | Pass |
| DEM Extents | Load all tiled DEMs into Global Mapper and verify complete coverage within the | Pass |

4/14/2021

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | (buffered) project boundary and verify that no tiles are corrupt | |
|--|--|--|

7. DERIVATIVE LIDAR PRODUCTS

USGS required several derivative lidar products to be created. Each type of derived product is described below.

7.1 Interswath Raster

Interswath raster representing interswath alignment have been delivered. This raster was created from the last return of all points except points classified as noise or flagged as withheld. The images are in .TIFF format.

7.2 Swath Separation Images

Swath separation images representing interswath alignment have been delivered. These images were created from the last return of all points except points classified as noise or flagged as withheld. The images are in .TIFF format. The swath separation images are symbolized by the following ranges:

- 0-8 cm: **Green**
- 8-16 cm: **Yellow**
- >16 cm: **Red**

7.3 Interswath and Intraswath Polygons

7.3.1 Interswath Accuracy

The Interswath accuracy, or overlap consistency, measures the variation in the lidar data within the swath overlap. Interswath accuracy measures the quality of the calibration or boresight adjustment of the data in each lift. Per USGS specifications, overlap consistency was assessed at multiple locations within overlap in non-vegetated areas of only single returns. As with precision, the interswath consistency was reported by way of a polygon shapefile delineating the sample areas checked and attributed with the following and using the cells within each polygon as sample values:

- Minimum difference in the sample area (numeric)
 - Maximum difference in the sample area (numeric)
 - RMSDz (Root Mean Square Difference in the vertical/z direction) of the sample area (numeric).
- Intraswath Accuracy

The intraswath accuracy, or the precision of lidar, measures variations on a surface expected to be flat and without variation. Precision is evaluated to confirm that the lidar system is performing properly and without gross internal error that may not be otherwise apparent. To measure the precision of a lidar dataset, level or flat surfaces were assessed. Swath data were assessed using only first returns in non-vegetated areas.

Precision was reported by way of a polygon shapefile delineating the sample areas checked and attributed with the following and using the cells within each polygon as sample values:

4/14/2021

- Minimum slope-corrected range (numeric)
- Maximum slope-corrected range (numeric)
- RMSDz of the slope-corrected range (numeric).