

# **Matanuska-Susitna Borough LiDAR & Imagery Project Quality Assurance Report Point Mackenzie Block**

---



---

**Written by Rick Guritz**

**Alaska Satellite Facility**

**April 15, 2012**

## Contents

---

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Study Area – Point Mackenzie Block.....                                 | 3  |
| Basis for Evaluation.....   | 3  |
| Format and Completeness of Data Delivery .....                          | 4  |
| Completeness, Clarity, and Compliance of Metadata .....                 | 5  |
| Planimetric Accuracy of the LiDAR Data .....                            | 5  |
| Vertical Accuracy of the LiDAR Data .....                               | 5  |
| LiDAR Point Cloud First-Return Density and Classification Accuracy..... | 7  |
| LiDAR Gridded Products.....   | 9  |
| LiDAR Derived Products .....  | 10 |
| Point Mackenzie Block Results and Recommendations .....                 | 11 |
| Delivery History and Reported Data Quality Issues.....                  | 55 |
| Delivery 1 & 2.....   | 55 |
| Delivery 3 .....  | 56 |
| Delivery 4 .....  | 57 |
| Delivery 5 .....  | 57 |
| Delivery 6 .....  | 58 |

## Study Area – Point Mackenzie Block

The study area for this report is the Point Mackenzie block, which includes 583 square miles covering the southern extent of the Susitna Valley. In the delivery blocks and tile map, it is shown in dark green (see Figure 1).

## Basis for Evaluation

The Software used for the evaluation includes:

- ESRI ArcMap and ArcCatalog 10.0
- Applied Imagery Quick Terrain Modeler v7.1.5 64-bit
- Blue Marble Geographics, Global Mapper v13.1.2

Each block of LiDAR will be evaluated in the following ways:

- Check formatting and completeness of data delivery,
- Check completeness, clarity, and compliance of metadata,
- Assess the planimetric accuracy of the LiDAR data,
- Assess the vertical accuracy of the LiDAR data,
- Assess the LiDAR point cloud data of return density and classification accuracy,
- Assess the LiDAR bare-Earth and first-return surface data by mosaic and shaded relief analysis, identifying gaps, seams, anomalies, and hydro-flattening of data,
- Verify consistency of various derived products being provided by LiDAR contractor.

Itemized products to be evaluated include:

- Metadata
- Classified point cloud data in LAS format
- Bare-Earth surface (below canopy raster DEM)
- First-Return surface (top of canopy raster DSM)
- Intensity image composite
- Hydro-flattening breaklines (single and double line) and lake polygons
- Contours (elevation)
- Shaded relief mosaics
- Tile Index (full and quarter tile) and building feature classes (structures >400 square feet)

## Format and Completeness of Data Delivery

Six separate data deliveries were required to correct all identified data anomalies. Each delivery provided data on an external computer disk organized by block and data type. The Point Mackenzie block deliveries included:

- Metadata – A single metadata file for each major product type including point clouds, raster bare-Earth DEM, raster first-return DSM, elevation contours, elevation contours in DXF.
- LiDAR DATA - LAS point cloud data for 269 quarter tiles covering 71 full tiles of data.
- Contours – DXF format contours for 260 quarter tiles covering 71 full tiles of data.
- Block Geodatabase which contained the following elements:
  - Bare-Earth DEM raster catalog,
  - Buildings feature dataset,
  - Contours feature dataset,
  - First-return DSM raster catalog,
  - Hydro features dataset including single and double breaklines and lake polygons,
  - Intensity Imagery raster catalog,
  - Tile index feature datasets including full and quarter tile,
  - Block boundary polygon.

The contents of the LiDAR point cloud files were verified to include the expected LiDAR classification layers. Then each layer was loaded into Quick Terrain Modeler (QTM) to verify coverage and extent of each classification layer. Each layer was captured to a computer graphic image in jpeg format for review. In some cases, the number of points within a classification layer needed to be separated into quarter block areas to keep within available memory (16 GB) to optimize RAM. In these cases up to four jpeg images were saved for the layer. Although this process was time consuming, it proved very useful in identifying omissions in coverage for particular classifications. By saving each layer in QTM, the number of points included in each classification layer was compiled to verify that the data was distributed appropriately between classification layers.

The contractor supplied GIS layers including block boundary, full and quarter tile indexes were displayed and evaluated to insure consistency with the original project coverage feature class (see Figure 2). The raster catalogs stored in the block geodatabase were combined into large scale raster mosaics and stored as geotiff products for evaluation purposes. Shaded relief images were produced from each of the surface elevation products to evaluate completeness of coverage, gaps, seams, or other data

anomalies. The intensity image mosaic was also evaluated for completeness of coverage and quality of data.

## Completeness, Clarity, and Compliance of Metadata

Each metadata file was examined for both content and clarity of the included metadata descriptions. Minor changes were requested when UAF spotted inaccuracies or omissions. In general, UAF found the metadata to be very good. To test for FGDC metadata format compliance, we used the USGS Metadata Parser (MP) program. Results of testing showed on the order of 70 to 71 errors per fundamental data type of which 34 were unrecognized, 35 were missing, and 2 were bad values. The MP program output was fairly consistent for each metadata file. These errors were reported to Aerometric and fixed and verified through subsequent testing. No metadata errors were reported with the revised metadata.

## Planimetric Accuracy of the LiDAR Data

There were only two checkpoints for the developed classification in the Point Mackenzie block. The survey contractor, Lounsbury & Associates, identified and surveyed the corners of two small buildings in tile PM50NW as developed class checkpoints. The LiDAR intensity from the returns off the building roof did not provide enough contrast to the ground to be accurately identified. Viewing the point cloud data, the building roof could be easily identified. A marker (push pin) was created at each checkpoint coordinate using Quick Terrain Modeler (QTM) and several views were captured to show the alignment of the point with the returns from the roof. Both points showed good agreement with the LiDAR data. A PowerPoint file was compiled with a variety of screen shots to document this analysis along with information provided by the survey contractor for each checkpoint (see Figure 3-8).

## Vertical Accuracy of the LiDAR Data

There were fourteen checkpoints within the Point Mackenzie block. These included two forested, two developed, eight wetlands & two barren points in each land cover classifications. Using ArcMap, a Bare-Earth DEM mosaic was produced and elevation values for all checkpoints were extracted from the DEM. This was compiled into a spreadsheet and organized by land cover classifications on separate worksheets (see Figure 9). A vertical accuracy assessment was done for each land cover classification and compared to accuracy requirements included in the LiDAR contract. UAF also looked at the combined class statistics which are included below. The contractual target accuracies are listed to the right of each accuracy measurement. The accuracy measurement is colored green if it passed or red if it failed to meet the requirement. For Point Mackenzie block, all classes except the wetlands class were accurate enough to meet the accuracy requirements. In the case of the wetlands class, there was one point that fell out of specification with a root mean squared error at 95% confidence at 0.43 meters instead of the accuracy requirement of 0.363 meters. **In consultation with Matanuska-Susitna Borough GIS staff, this was acceptable recognizing how difficult wetlands data can be to map accurately.**

| <b>Barren Land</b>          |             |              | <b>Target</b>   |
|-----------------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|
| <b>Statistical Summary:</b> | <b>Feet</b> | <b>Meter</b> | <b>Accuracy</b> |
| Count = 2 pts               |             |              |                 |
| Min =                       | 0.063       | 0.019        |                 |
| Max =                       | 0.135       | 0.041        |                 |
| Mean =                      | 0.099       | 0.030        |                 |
| RMSE =                      | 0.105       | 0.032        |                 |
| RMSE*1.96 (95%) =           | 0.206       | 0.063        | < 0.245 m       |
| Stddev =                    | 0.036       | 0.011        |                 |

Table 1, Barren Land Accuracy Assessment Summary

| <b>Developed</b>            |             |              | <b>Target</b>   |
|-----------------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|
| <b>Statistical Summary:</b> | <b>Feet</b> | <b>Meter</b> | <b>Accuracy</b> |
| Count = 2 pts               |             |              |                 |
| Min =                       | -0.298      | -0.091       |                 |
| Max =                       | 0.009       | 0.003        |                 |
| Mean =                      | -0.144      | -0.044       |                 |
| RMSE =                      | 0.210       | 0.064        |                 |
| RMSE*1.96 (95%) =           | 0.413       | 0.126        | < 0.363 m       |
| Stddev =                    | 0.153       | 0.047        |                 |

Table 2, Developed Land Accuracy Assessment Summary

| <b>Forested</b>             |             |              | <b>Target</b>   |
|-----------------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|
| <b>Statistical Summary:</b> | <b>Feet</b> | <b>Meter</b> | <b>Accuracy</b> |
| Count = 2 pts               |             |              |                 |
| Min =                       | 0.041       | 0.012        |                 |
| Max =                       | 0.248       | 0.075        |                 |
| Mean =                      | 0.144       | 0.044        |                 |
| RMSE =                      | 0.177       | 0.054        |                 |
| RMSE*1.96 (95%) =           | 0.348       | 0.106        | < 0.363 m       |
| Stddev =                    | 0.103       | 0.032        |                 |

Table 3, Forested Land Accuracy Assessment Summary

| <b>Wetlands</b>             |             |              | <b>Target</b>   |
|-----------------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|
| <b>Statistical Summary:</b> | <b>Feet</b> | <b>Meter</b> | <b>Accuracy</b> |
| Count = 8 pts               |             |              |                 |
| Min =                       | -0.093      | -0.028       |                 |
| Max =                       | 1.884       | 0.574        |                 |
| Mean =                      | 0.424       | 0.129        |                 |
| RMSE =                      | 0.719       | 0.219        |                 |
| RMSE*1.96 (95%) =           | 1.410       | 0.430        | > 0.363 m       |
| Stddev =                    | 0.581       | 0.177        |                 |

Table 4, Wetlands Accuracy Assessment Summary

| <b>Combined Classes</b>     |             |              | <b>Target</b>   |
|-----------------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|
| <b>Statistical Summary:</b> | <b>Feet</b> | <b>Meter</b> | <b>Accuracy</b> |
| Count = 14 pts              |             |              |                 |
| Min =                       | -0.298      | -0.091       |                 |
| Max =                       | 1.884       | 0.574        |                 |
| Mean =                      | 0.256       | 0.078        |                 |
| RMSE =                      | 0.555       | 0.169        |                 |
| RMSE*1.96 (95%) =           | 1.088       | 0.332        | < 0.363 m       |
| Stddev =                    | 0.492       | 0.150        |                 |

Table 5, Combined Classes Accuracy Assessment Summary

## LiDAR Point Cloud First-Return Density and Classification Accuracy

Point Density was determined using LAS tools provided by Aerometric. The application provides an ability to count point density creating ESRI ASCII GRID files for each tile. Global Mapper was used to read and display all of these grid files for the block (see Figure 10). We had to limit the point density per cell to a maximum of 10 points clamping values greater to that value so that the color map would show sufficient color variation at the low end. Point density is displayed using a color map from blue (low) to red (high). The grid spacing used for the evaluation was 4 feet per pixel, 2\*NPS of 0.6 meter as specified in the contract. The First-Return of all valid classes (2-6, 8-11, and 13-14), excluding withheld bit data classes (1 and 7). At least 90% of the cells should contain at least one LiDAR point. Regions of no return are shown in dark blue which only occurs outside of the block boundary. For the Point Mackenzie block, first-return density was confirmed to exceed 90% for all interior cells of the combined point cloud data.

Each classification layer in the LAS point cloud was loaded into Quick Terrain Modeler to verify extent and completeness of coverage, number of points per class, and accuracy of classification. Given the number of points included in some of the larger classifications, it is necessary to split the block into quarters (i.e. SW, SE, NW, NE). Some classes such as the low, medium, and high vegetation are texture mapped using a solid color such as light, medium, and dark green respectively. Otherwise, the data is displayed with a color ramp for the elevation range of the block. In this way, the four blocks can be

assembled into complete block coverage with a consistent color map for the height variation. During the assessments, UAF found and reported inconsistencies where data were omitted or regions where data were included over water that should have been excluded. **The LiDAR point cloud data was improved significantly by Aerometric including splitting class 1 into a new class 13 and refining the low vegetation class.**

The classifications included in the LAS point cloud data are listed below in order of class with point count totals per class:

| <u>Class # - Class Description</u>                 | <u>Point Count</u> | <u>Reference</u> |
|--|--------------------|------------------|
| Class 1 – Unclassified Data (marked as withheld)   | 431,683,318        | Figure 11        |
| Class 2 – Ground                                   | 1,397,508,138      | Figure 12        |
| Class 3 – Low Vegetation                           | 1,395,986,038      | Figure 13        |
| Class 4 – Medium Vegetation                        | 166,916,038        | Figure 14        |
| Class 5 – High Vegetation                          | 963,545,923        | Figure 15        |
| Class 6 – Buildings                                | 1,187,390          | Figure 16        |
| Class 7 – Error Points (Noise)                     | 44,841,021         | Figure 17        |
| Class 8 – Ground Model Key Points                  | 90,318,776         | Figure 18        |
| Class 9 – Water                                    | 205,746,217        | Figure 19        |
| Class 10 – Breakline Proximity                     | 1,404,272          | Figure 20        |
| Class 11 – Power Transmission Lines                | 317,500            | Figure 21        |
| Class 13 – Ground Clutter (within foot of surface) | 1,545,042,396      | Figure 22        |
| Class 14 – Bridge Decks                            | 541                | Figure 23        |

Table 6, LiDAR Point Cloud Classes Summary Table

Cross validation analysis was performed between each of the class layers and other source data. Quick Terrain Modeler was used initially to produce height profiles of multiple layers from a point cloud. This capability was used to verify issues with the low vegetation layer extending across rivers and streams (see Figure 24). This shows the presence of LiDAR returns from each vegetation layer, low, medium and high. Another example, a canopy height can be estimated by subtracting the bare-Earth surface DEM from the first-return DSM (see Figure 25). This product could then be colorized based on a number of classifications to match each of the three vegetation layers (see Figure 26), i.e. 1-6 feet for low vegetation (light green), 6-15 feet for medium vegetation (medium green), and greater than 15 feet for high vegetation (dark green). Barren ground could have height differences from -1 to 1 foot. Other classes could draw attention to outlier heights such as values less than one (red) and values greater than 100 feet (violet). The individual layer product could be compared to this classified product, keeping in mind that in high vegetation, there may also be returns for medium vegetation, low vegetation, or even ground. Other layers such as water can be compared to the lakes, single and double breakline files provided by the contractor. Similarly, the buildings layer can be compared to both the buildings feature class and to the ortho imagery for the block.



## LiDAR Gridded Products

There are three gridded products being delivered for each block. These include the bare-Earth DEM, the first-return DSM, and the LiDAR intensity image. Each of these raster data sets are being delivered as raster catalogs within the block geodatabase. For each type of data, a mosaic product was produced from each raster catalog (see Figure 27, 28, and 29). Then for the two surface products, a shaded relief image is produced with consistent elevation and angle of the sun to provide consistency (see Figure 30 and 31). These derived images are then evaluated visually by zooming up to a tile per screen and panning through the mosaic, left to right, and top to bottom. Any height discontinuity between swaths or tiles would show up as a darker linear feature with a common orientation (to detect seams). Any regions of missing data will show up as dark edge to white interior of the missing data (to detect voids). Surface texture gives clues to intermittent vegetation (to detect corn rows) which may or may not be valid depending on the surface type. If anomalies are detected, then comparison to tile edges or swath edges can be made by bringing in other GIS layers for comparison.

For the Point Mackenzie block, seams were detected in two tiles of the bare-Earth DEM, and lots of seams were present in the LiDAR intensity image mosaic. These problems were reported and later fixed in subsequent deliveries. Careful examination of the shaded relief image produced from the first-return showed interpolation anomalies over water that helped determine that the first-return DSM was not a true first return from the LiDAR. We requested the contractor to not use interpolation to fill holes over water and to produce a true first-return product from the LiDAR as a gridded evaluation of all non-withheld returns. Several redeliveries were needed to get the right results, such that a canopy height assessment could be calculated from the two gridded products and classified to vegetation height. The resulting classification needed to hold up at full resolution and compare favorably with the point cloud layers assessment.

The bare-Earth gridded DEM is hydro flattened according to contract specifications. To verify this and to insure consistent heights were retained over water features, GIS analysis was performed on the contractor supplied data. The hydro breaklines include lake polygons, and either single for small streams and double breaklines for larger streams are included (see Figure 32). First the lake polygons were used to clip the bare-Earth DEM elevations for lake heights. This was compared to the water heights layer from the point cloud data. By loading consistent color map, contract stretch method to linear and minimum/maximum height range into both ArcMap and Quick Terrain Modeler the resulting images can be compared for consistency. Streams greater than 100 feet nominal width and a list of nineteen streams supplied by the Matanuska-Susitna Borough (appendix 4A) should be delineated with double breaklines. These polyline structures are combined to create polygons for each stream or river contained in the block. The hydro breaklines were delivered as polylines, so additional editing was needed to separate major rivers and streams from each other as individual polygons. Then the bare-Earth DEM was clipped for each river, stream, or slough, colorized and compared to the point cloud layer for that specific water body. A similar approach is taken within Quick Terrain Modeler for the specific water body so that the heights of the flattened water can be compared to the original LiDAR returns over that water surface. In this way, all streams could be checked for flow direction, magnitude, and consistency to the original LiDAR returns over that water body. For the Point Mackenzie block, we

analyzed lakes (see Figure 33) and streams including the Susitna River (see Figure 34), the Little Susitna River (See Figure 35), Little Fish Creek (see Figure 36), and Upper Fish Creek (see Figure 37), from which all hydro flattening looked good.

## **LiDAR Derived Products**

Derived products include a variety of GIS layers including tile index, hydro breaklines of lakes and streams, building feature class and topographic contours. These are delivered as elements in a block geodatabase. The tile index feature class provides both full tile and quarter tile. Aerometric was asked to include a block boundary feature class for each block that defines the geographic extent of each block. This should align where blocks join each other and provide a 100 meter buffer where no adjacent blocks are present. The boundary file is first checked against the original block definition provided with the LiDAR contract by Matanuska-Susitna Borough. The desired coverage and added buffer distance has been verified.

The building feature class is verified by performing a detailed examination of the quarter tile with the most buildings. Visual verification is performed on each building to the ortho imagery or canopy height difference classification (see Figure 38 and 39) looking for buildings that were missed or classified building that were incorrect identified (false positives). Buildings of greater than 400 square feet should be included at 97% success rate. Separate feature classes are created for new buildings and buildings that were misclassified (false positives). Areas are calculated for new buildings and the accuracy for this quarter tile is checked and reported. Given the limited time, the quarter tile with the highest building density was checked for accuracy and reported as representative of the block. For the Point Mackenzie block, there were 17 new buildings added of which 10 were greater than 400 square feet. Of the original building classification, it looked like two were incorrectly classified (false positive) as building when it was a forested location, with one building over 400 square feet. If you consider only buildings over 400 square feet in area, then 11 errors were made of 486 buildings at a 2.26% error rate or 97.74% success rate which meets the required accuracy of 97%. A final building figure (see Figure 40) is produced with accurate buildings (light blue), Incorrect buildings (red), and new buildings (dark blue) to document results from the analysis. Separate feature classes for each of the three categories are also produced for further analysis and provided to the Matanuska-Susitna Borough GIS staff.

The elevation contours are supplied in two different formats, one as a polyline feature for each tile in the block geodatabase, and the other is in AutoCAD format DXF format. A set of four contour tiles are displayed as an overlay to the bare-Earth DEM and visually examined for consistency. Due to limited time, only a statistical sample of the data is evaluated. The Matanuska-Susitna Borough GIS staff suggested that UAF pick contour tiles with the steepest slope as candidates for testing. A slope map in degrees was first generated from the bare-Earth DEM mosaic and colorized with a blue to red color map with steepest terrain in red (see Figure 41). From this map, tiles with the steepest terrain were selected. Each of four tiles were displayed and compared with the bare-Earth DEM elevations for that tile. The tighter the space between contours, the steeper the slope should be in the corresponding DEM. This can be visually compared to how rapid the change is color of the underlying DEM. Next, UAF created topologies for each of the selected tiles, testing for contour topology errors based on four selected

rules. These rules include: there are no intersects, there are no overlaps, there are no dangles (except at tile edges), and must be single part. Each contour tile was then evaluated to these topology rules and errors were documented and reported to Aerometric. For Point Mackenzie block, three of four tiles tested showed topology errors that needed to be fixed. Using the topology edit tool, zooms of each error was captured in a graphic file and sent to Aerometric to be fixed. We requested that Aerometric test all tiles using the same methodology, not just the ones we reported. Upon redelivery of the data, we doubled the number of tiles tested to verify that everything was good (see Figure 42 and 43).

Quick Terrain Modeler has an ability to drape the AutoCAD contour files in DXF format over a corresponding DEM and visualize it in 3D. This capability was used to spot check the DXF files for problems (see Figure 44). The Point Mackenzie contour products were spot checked for completeness and accuracy.

## **Point Mackenzie Block Results and Recommendations**

After significant effort testing, documenting data quality issues, consulting with Aerometric and the Matanuska-Susitna Borough GIS staff, and testing six redeliveries. UAF is confident that the Point Mackenzie block is of acceptable quality. The spatial extent, coverage provided, horizontal and vertical accuracy, completeness and consistency of products makes this block the first of which we recommend acceptance. Aerometric has worked hard to address all of the identified quality issues to date. UAF has thoroughly documented the results of its assessments, including a complete record of all quality issues to date and what the solution was for each case. There were a few issues that the Matanuska-Susitna Borough staff accepted without modification. These include:

- 1) The presence of one outlier checkpoint in the wetlands category caused the class to fail its accuracy specification. This was only one of eight points for this class and one of sixteen points overall with all other points within specification.
- 2) The spatial dimensions of both the LiDAR intensity and First Return DSM showed non-square pixels by a very small round off error. Aerometric assured us that the data was created with identical pixel dimensions.

**Upon completion of writing this report and reviewing the results of our assessments, UAF recommends that the Point Mackenzie block be accepted. We are very pleased that the quality of data for this block. Aerometric is applying lessons learned from each reported data quality issue to subsequent block deliveries.**




Figure 1, Mat-Su LiDAR & Imagery Project Delivery Blocks & Tiles Map




Figure 2, Contractor Supplied GIS Layers. Full tile (violet), quarter tile (tan), and block boundary (blue).



Figure 3, Ortho imagery with arrows pointing out two checkpoint locations in imagery.




Figure 4, LiDAR Point Cloud Display of Bare Earth and intensity with checkpoints marked.

# CP 5-875 Contractor Pictures

Check Point: 5-875  
Latitude: 61 26 15.182543 N  
Longitude: 150 10 05.628330 W  
SPC-East: 1610967.4811  
SPC-North: 2717395.3558  
Ortho\_HT\_FT: 99.62  
HZ\_ACC\_FT: 0.01  
VT\_ACC\_FT: 0.02



Figure 5, Checkpoint survey contractor pictures of CP 5-875 at corner of outhouse.



CP 5-875  
LiDAR Analysis with QTM



Good Alignment of point 5-875 with SE corner of outhouse roof.




Figure 6, LiDAR point cloud assessment with QTM marking checkpoint location.


# CP 5-876 Contractor Pictures

Check Point: 5-875  
Latitude: 61 26 15.148276 N  
Longitude: 150 10 16.365351 W  
SPC-East: 1610445.3858 E  
SPC-North: 2717393.1450 N  
Ortho\_HT\_FT: 103.06  
HZ\_ACC\_FT: 0.01  
VT\_ACC\_FT: 0.02



Figure 7, Checkpoint Survey contractor pictures of CP 5-876 at corner of outhouse.

CP 5-876  
LiDAR Analysis with QTM



Good Alignment of point 5-876 with SE corner of outhouse roof.





Figure 8, LiDAR point cloud assessment with QTM marking checkpoint location.

Block1\_Accuracy\_Assessment - Microsoft Excel

| QC    | Geographic        |                    |              | Stateplane 5004 |            | GPS Checkpoint |             | LIDAR   | Ht Diff   | Height |                             |        |             |              |  |  |
|-------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------|-----------------|------------|----------------|-------------|---------|-----------|--------|-----------------------------|--------|-------------|--------------|--|--|
| Point | Latitude (dms)    | Longitude (dms)    | Northing (m) | Easting (m)     | Elipsoid_H | Ortho_H        | LC Type     | Ortho_H | LIDAR - G | Diff^2 |                             |        |             |              |  |  |
| 5-553 | 61 26 24.150217 N | 150 09 16.401358 W | 2718299.9791 | 1613363.3468    | 119.2100   | 100.4800       | FOREST      | 100.521 | 0.041     | 0.002  |                             |        |             |              |  |  |
| 5-554 | 61 26 24.322498 N | 150 09 12.707170 W | 2718317.0494 | 1613543.0064    | 119.4900   | 100.7400       | FOREST      | 100.988 | 0.248     | 0.061  |                             |        |             |              |  |  |
| 5-876 | 61 26 15.148276 N | 150 10 16.365351 W | 2717393.1450 | 1610445.3858    | 121.6000   | 103.0600       | DEVELOPED   | 103.069 | 0.009     | 0.000  |                             |        |             |              |  |  |
| 5-875 | 61 26 15.182543 N | 150 10 05.628330 W | 2717395.3558 | 1610967.4811    | 118.2700   | 99.6200        | DEVELOPED   | 99.322  | -0.298    | 0.089  |                             |        |             |              |  |  |
| 5-963 | 61 18 35.771347 N | 150 04 43.622259 W | 2670714.6990 | 1626569.0640    | 113.7800   | 94.2300        | WETLANDS    | 94.285  | 0.055     | 0.003  |                             |        |             |              |  |  |
| 5-964 | 61 18 37.096340 N | 150 04 41.264479 W | 2670849.0900 | 1626684.1767    | 114.8300   | 94.8700        | WETLANDS    | 94.777  | -0.093    | 0.009  |                             |        |             |              |  |  |
| 5-965 | 61 23 47.279220 N | 149 52 07.369966 W | 2702361.4533 | 1663428.9410    | 46.0700    | 23.5300        | WETLANDS    | 23.979  | 0.449     | 0.202  |                             |        |             |              |  |  |
| 5-966 | 61 23 46.395483 N | 149 52 07.986542 W | 2702271.6386 | 1663399.0817    | 46.1700    | 23.6200        | WETLANDS    | 23.745  | 0.125     | 0.016  |                             |        |             |              |  |  |
| 5-962 | 61 26 09.210254 N | 150 10 20.969272 W | 2716790.7508 | 1610219.9223    | 54.1700    | 35.6400        | WETLANDS    | 35.822  | 0.182     | 0.033  |                             |        |             |              |  |  |
| 5-961 | 61 26 09.583004 N | 150 10 18.981167 W | 2716828.4136 | 1610316.6786    | 54.3400    | 35.6900        | WETLANDS    | 36.179  | 0.489     | 0.240  |                             |        |             |              |  |  |
| 4-956 | 61 30 44.652147 N | 149 56 39.508425 W | 2744724.7220 | 1650146.4334    | 169.4400   | 146.7200       | WETLANDS    | 148.604 | 1.884     | 3.550  |                             |        |             |              |  |  |
| 4-958 | 61 30 44.048300 N | 149 56 36.529571 W | 2744663.5271 | 1650290.9887    | 170.9100   | 148.1700       | WETLANDS    | 148.467 | 0.297     | 0.088  |                             |        |             |              |  |  |
| 5-765 | 61 17 05.988758 N | 149 57 10.346918 W | 2661592.1834 | 1648706.4516    | 159.9900   | 138.2800       | BARREN LAND | 138.415 | 0.135     | 0.018  |                             |        |             |              |  |  |
| 5-766 | 61 17 07.013154 N | 149 57 07.910600 W | 2661696.2953 | 1648825.4209    | 161.9400   | 140.2200       | BARREN LAND | 140.283 | 0.063     | 0.004  |                             |        |             |              |  |  |
|       |                   |                    |              |                 |            |                |             |         |           |        | <b>Statistical Summary:</b> |        | <b>Feet</b> | <b>Meter</b> |  |  |
|       |                   |                    |              |                 |            |                |             |         |           |        | Count = 14 pts              |        |             |              |  |  |
|       |                   |                    |              |                 |            |                |             |         |           |        | Min =                       | -0.298 | -0.091      |              |  |  |
|       |                   |                    |              |                 |            |                |             |         |           |        | Max =                       | 1.884  | 0.574       |              |  |  |
|       |                   |                    |              |                 |            |                |             |         |           |        | Mean =                      | 0.256  | 0.078       |              |  |  |
|       |                   |                    |              |                 |            |                |             |         |           |        | RMSE =                      | 0.555  | 0.169       |              |  |  |
|       |                   |                    |              |                 |            |                |             |         |           |        | RMSE*1.96 (95%) =           | 1.088  | 0.332       | < 0.363 m    |  |  |
|       |                   |                    |              |                 |            |                |             |         |           |        | Stddev =                    | 0.492  | 0.150       |              |  |  |

Figure 9, Vertical Accuracy Assessment using Lounsbury Checkpoint Survey.




Figure 10, LiDAR First-Return Point Count




Figure 11, Class 1 – Unclassified.




Figure 12, Class 2 – Ground.




Figure 13, Class 3 – Low Vegetation.






Figure 14, Class 4 – Medium Vegetation



.Figure 15, Class 5 – High Vegetation.




Figure 16, Class 6 – Buildings.




Figure 17, Class 7 – Error Points.




Figure 18, Class 8 – Ground Model Keypoints.




Figure 19, Class 9 – Water.




Figure 20, Class 10 – Breakline Proximity.




Figure 21, Class 11 – Power Transmission Lines.






Figure 22, Class 13 – Surface Clutter.




Figure 23, Class 14 – Bridge Decks with Zoom showing one Bridge Deck.




Figure 24, Vegetation Class Height Profile.



Figure 25, Canopy Height Difference (DSM - DEM).




Figure 26, Canopy Height Classification.




Figure 27, Bare-Earth Gridded DEM.




Figure 28, First-Return Gridded DSM.




Figure 29, LiDAR Intensity Gridded Mosaic.




Figure 30, Shaded Relief Bare-Earth Gridded DEM.






Figure 31, Shaded Relief First-Return Gridded DSM.




Figure 32, Contractor Supplied Hydro GIS Layers.




Figure 33, Lake Elevation Comparison (left GIS, right QTM).




Figure 34, Susitna River Elevations (left GIS, right QTM).




Figure 35, Little Susitna River Elevations (left GIS, right QTM).




Figure 36, Little Fish Creek Elevations (left Hydro flattened DEM, right LiDAR Point Cloud).




Figure 37, Upper Fish Creek (Top Hydro Flattened DEM, Bottom LiDAR Point Cloud)




Figure 38, Building Analysis – Ortho vs. Canopy Height Classification.






Figure 39, Building Analysis – Ortho vs. Canopy Height Classification with Building Footprint.



Figure 40, Building Analysis Results (Lt.Blue – Correct, Red – Incorrect, Dark Blue – Added)




Figure 41, Degree Slope Selected Contour Tiles for Topology Testing.




Figure 42, First Four Topology Checks .




Figure 43, Second Set of Four Topology Checks.




Figure 44, DXF Contour 3D Drape in QTM.

## Delivery History and Reported Data Quality Issues

**Delivery 1 & 2** - Aerometric delivered to UAF the first Point Mackenzie LiDAR data Oct. 21, 2011. This provided the LAS point cloud data so that UAF could start their evaluation. A second full delivery was received on Nov. 8, 2011 which included all LiDAR contract deliverables. Upon receipt of this complete delivery, we requested a copy of the corresponding ortho imagery for use in our quality assessments. UAF began its review of the LiDAR point cloud data with this first delivery and began reporting quality issues as problems were discovered. The following provides a brief description of each quality issue found in deliveries 1 & 2 and when they were reported.

**Detected Seam in bare-Earth DEM** – On 11/09/2011, an observed seam was reported when trying to mosaic bare-Earth DEM tiles. This seam was several pixels wide running west to East between two sets of tiles (see Figure 45).

**Anomalies identified in single breaklines** – On 11/10/2011, ten screen captures were provided to Aerometric identifying inconsistencies between single breaklines and either LiDAR intensity data or the bare-Earth DEM (see Figure 46-47). These were primarily over channels in the mud flats. After review, Aerometric decided to remove most of these breaklines because they were too difficult to determine accurately. The corrected hydro layers have very few breaklines in the mud flats (see Figure 48).

**Anomalies in First Return DSM** – On 11/11/2011, interpolation errors were observed in portions of the Little Susitna River (See Figure 49). In a true first return product, the LiDAR data should be evaluated on a cell by cell basis using the delivery grid as the basis for evaluation. All valid LiDAR returns (excluding points marked as withheld, class 1 and 7) should be evaluated for the highest return for that cell. For cells over water, there may not be a valid return for that cell, in which case the cell should be set to NoData. In discussion with Aerometric, they were using interpolation to fill holes over water which is undesirable. They were also using a gridding process that did not provide a true first return gridded product. After discussion, Aerometric was asked to change their processing methods to something that would provide a true first return product. This change was considered essential for a true canopy height product to be generated and for cross validation between gridded data and LiDAR point cloud data.

**Detected Seams in LiDAR Intensity data** – On 11/11/2011, observed seams were reported when trying to mosaic LiDAR Intensity data (see Figure 50). The seams were very obvious running from West to East and up to several pixels wide in places. After further investigation by Aerometric, they decided to use raster catalogs within the block geodatabase for all raster grids for future deliveries. This change eliminated the presence of seams in the data. It also was a much improved method for delivering raster data than what was initially used.

**Clipping of Point Mackenzie Dock** – On 11/11/2011, during visual assessment of the shaded relief product clipping of the Point Mackenzie dock was identified and reported (see Figure 51). An exception to the original block boundary was made to include the dock structure in both LiDAR intensity and first return DSM. This is an important structure that should be included in the resulting data. It should be noted that the original coverage requested by Matanuska-Susitna Borough GIS staff was the source of the error. Fortunately, the LiDAR coverage could be adjusted to cover the entire dock and breakwater.

**Negative values in canopy height difference** – On 11/22/2011, negative values greater than -1 foot was observed in two locations of the Point Mackenzie block (see Figure 52). One was in the Susitna River delta, which was attributed to tidal fluctuations. The other was an area near some agricultural fields. One of these errors was eliminated when the rigorous first return DSM product was generated (See Figure 53). For our evaluation, we expect noise levels to be on the order of plus or minus one foot. Any negative values greater than one foot are not real and should be eliminated in the data.

**Low Vegetation not useful as initially defined 0-6 feet** – On 11/23/2011, Aerometric was informed that the low vegetation class as initially defined with structures from 0-6 feet. There was no difference from the spatial extent of low vegetation and ground classes (See Figure 54). Given an accepted noise level in the data of one foot, UAF suggested that they redefine low vegetation as 1 to 6 feet. This should define a tighter spatial extent than ground and actually be useful, instead of redundant.

**Delivery 3** - Aerometric delivered to UAF a third delivery disk on 12/14/2011. This disk included both Point Mackenzie and Willow blocks. It also combined both LiDAR and ortho imagery for the two blocks. This delivery was to address all of the reported quality issues to date. The following provides a brief description of each quality issue found in deliveries 3 and when they were reported.

**Raster layers in block Geodatabase had no defined coordinate systems** – On 12/16/2011, UAF reported that the bare-Earth and First-Return raster catalogs had unknown spatial reference. This was easily fixed in ArcCatalog by defining the spatial reference as NAD\_1983\_StatePlane\_Alaska\_4\_FIPS\_5004\_Feet. We requested that Aerometric make sure that all layers have a defined spatial reference in future deliveries.

**LiDAR Intensity has non-square pixel** – On 12/16/2011, UAF reported the LiDAR Intensity data having a non-square pixel with dimensions of 3.2807999999999991 x 3.2808. This was discussed and Aerometric attributed this to the precision of ESRI software and how it handles round off. Matanuska-Susitna Borough finally decided that this was acceptable and no change was needed.

**LiDAR intensity boarder not set to NoData** - On 12/16/2011, UAF reported that fill values outside the block boundary were set to 249 or white and 0 or black (See Figure 55). UAF requested that these should be set to NoData to be similar to the bare-Earth and First-Return gridded products.

**First-return in meters instead of feet** - On 12/16/2011, UAF reported the new first-return DSM had a very different height range from the bare-Earth DEM. It looked like the first-return DSM was in meters instead of feet causing the very different elevation range.

**Inconsistencies in Low Vegetation** – On 12/19/2011, UAF reported several inconsistencies in the low vegetation class. There were four tiles over ocean that incorrectly included low vegetation in water (PM\_033\_NE, PM\_043\_SW, PM\_043\_NE, PM\_009\_SE). There was one tile which did not include low vegetation where it should (PM\_009\_SW). There were points along a line or breakline (PM\_004\_SE, PM\_004\_NE). There was a missing river section (PM\_046\_NE) and a missing lake section (PM\_070\_NE).

**Bare-Earth DEM needs to be trimmed to block boundary** – On 12/20/2011, UAF reported bare-Earth tile PM\_063 needs to be trimmed to the block boundary (see Figure 56). With data extending beyond



the block boundary, it made for large differences to be detected when subtracting the bare-Earth DEM from the first-return DSM. UAF encouraged Aerometric to produce and deliver a block boundary layer with its tile grids in future deliveries.

**Contour topology errors** – On 12/28/2011, UAF reported three tiles (PM022, PM042, and PM045) with contour topology errors (See Figure 57-59). This was determined after testing four tiles that contained the largest slopes and topology rules that were supplied by the Matanuska-Susitna Borough staff including: must not overlap, must not intersect, must not have dangles (except at tile edges), and must be single part.

**Class 1 Unclassified point counts too high** – On 12/30/2011, UAF reported point counts for unclassified (class 1) is larger than all other classes combined. The Matanuska-Susitna Borough GIS staff indicated that class 1 was in violation of the requirement to classify all LiDAR data according to the contract. In further discussion with Aerometric, it was learned that class 1 contained ends of swath data that was marked as withheld and surface clutter data that ranged from 1 to -1 feet of the surface. A compromise was reached asking Aerometric to create a new class 13 to contain the surface clutter data, and keeping the swath ends in the unclassified (class 1). This change made it easier to access either data given the separation into two different classes. It also made point density validation easier, allowing exclusion of class 1 and 7 from the point density counts.

**Topology Error in breaklines** – On 01/19/2012, UAF reported topology errors being detected in breaklines. UAF asked Aerometric to also test breaklines for topology errors prior to delivery.

**Request for Metadata** – On 01/25/2012, UAF requested Aerometric to provide metadata for Point Mackenzie and Willow blocks.

**Delivery 4** - Aerometric delivered to UAF a fourth delivery disk on 12/08/2012, which provided fixes to all data quality issues reported to date. The disk provided only LiDAR data for Point Mackenzie block. Prior to this delivery, a list of issues was provided to Aerometric to verify that fixes were made for all identified data quality issues. Soon after the delivery was made, UAF reported confirmations to many of the reported data quality issues. The following provides a brief description of each quality issue found in deliveries 4 and when they were reported.

**First-return pixel dimensions non-square** – On 02/09/2012, UAF reported the latest first-return DSM had non-square pixel dimensions of 3.280799999999995 by 3.2808. I also reported that the bare-Earth DEM did have a consistent square pixel dimension. Similar to the LiDAR Intensity grids, this was thought to be an ESRI issue of round off. Aerometric assured us that they created the products with consistent pixel dimensions of 3.2808 by 3.2808.

**Delivery 5** – Aerometric delivered to UAF a fifth delivery disk on 03/06/2012 containing LiDAR data for Point Mackenzie, Willow, and Caswell Lake blocks. For Point Mackenzie block, this delivery included fixed point cloud data that separated class 1 into class 1 and 13. It also included metadata for the block which was not provided previously. The following provides a brief description of each quality issue found in deliveries 5 and when they were reported.

**Metadata not FGDC compliant** – On 03/08/2012, UAF reported a number of metadata errors reported by the USGS MP software for checking FGDC format compliance. A summary of the errors detected was produced and supplied to Matanuska-Susitna Borough and Aerometric.

**Low Vegetation errors** – On 03/28/2012, UAF reported additional low vegetation errors that should be fixed (See Figure 60- 62). These include: the northern extent of cook inlet still has low vegetation over water (PM043), a block section of the Susitna River water classified as low vegetation (PM046NE and PM047NW), and a section of Big Lake that is classified as low vegetation (PM070).

**Delivery 6** – Aerometric delivered to UAF by FTP on 03/29/2012 fixes to the requested tiles of new LAS point cloud data to fix the low vegetation errors that were reported. **This final delivery of data completed the final corrections that were needed for acceptance of the Point Mackenzie block.**




Figure 45, Seam in Bare-Earth DEM (Left) Corrected (Right).




Figure 46, Single Hydro Breakline Inaccuracies.




Figure 47, Single Hydro Breakline Inaccuracies.




Figure 48, Corrected Hydro GIS Layers.




Figure 49, Interpolation Artifacts in First-Return DSM (Left), Corrected (Right).




Figure 50, Seams in LiDAR intensity mosaic (Left), corrected (Right).




Figure 51, Coverage Gap (Port) in First Return (Left), Extended (Right).




Figure 52, Canopy Height – FR minus BE, Regions of negative values over -1.




Figure 53, Corrected Canopy Height, Regions of negative values over -1.






Figure 54, Initial low vegetation class not as useful at 0-6 feet because it includes ground noise.




Figure 55, Fill values around good data inconsistent (Left), corrected (Right).




Figure 56, Bare-Earth DEM needs trimming (Left), corrected (Right).




Figure 57, Topology Errors in Contours (PM022).




Figure 58, Topology Errors in Contours (PM042).




Figure 59, Topology Errors in Contours (PM045).




Figure 60, Low vegetation (PM043) Left, corrected Right.




Figure 61, Low Vegetation (PM046-47) Top, corrected Bottom.




Figure 62, Low Vegetation (PM070) Left, corrected Right.