# LiDAR Quality Assessment Report

The USGS National Geospatial Technical Operations Center, Data Operations Branch is responsible for conducting reviews of all Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) point-cloud data and derived products delivered by a data supplier before it is approved for inclusion in the National Elevation Dataset. The USGS recognizes the complexity of LiDAR collection and processing performed by the data suppliers and has developed this Quality Assessment (QA) procedure to accommodate USGS collection and processing specifications with flexibility. The goal of this process is to assure LiDAR data are of sufficient quality for database population and scientific analysis. Concerns regarding the assessment of these data should be directed to the Chief, Data Operations Branch, 1400 Independence Road, Rolla, Missouri 65401.

WI_Taylor_2017

NGTOC
2017-06-07
Tim Willingham

Project Information

Project:

WI_Taylor_2017

Contractor:

Ayres Associates Inc

Project Type: *Applicable Specification:*

 Partnership   *NGP LiDAR Base Specification V 1.2*

Project Points of Contact:

Name:	Type:	Email:
Claire DeVaughan	NGP Liaison	cdevaugh@usgs.gov

REPORT QUALIFICATION SUMMARY:
Task Order Overall:
Does Not Meet Requirements
Metadata:
0 of 1   Reviews Accepted
1 Reviews Not Accepted
Vertical Accuracy:
1 of 1   Reviews Accepted
0 Reviews Not Accepted
Swath/Raw LAS:
1 of 1   Reviews Accepted
0 Reviews Not Accepted
Tiled/Classified LAS:
0 of 1   Reviews Accepted
1 Reviews Not Accepted
Breakline:
1 of 1   Reviews Accepted
0 Reviews Not Accepted
DEM(s):
0 of 1   Reviews Accepted
1 Reviews Not Accepted
NED Review:
0 of 1   DEM tile reviews recommended for NED 1/3rd
0 of 1   DEM tile reviews recommended for NED 1/9th

Project Subdivision: <u>None</u>

Dates Collected Range:

Collection Start: 4/14/2016

Collection End: 4/16/2016

Project Aliases:

Licensing:

<u>Public Domain</u>

Project Description:

The Taylor County lidar project is a portion of the Wisconsin WROC / 3DEP LiDAR 2016-17 acquisition task order, issued by Ayres under their Task Order 20 dated March 7, 2016. Project area covers approximately 992 square miles which includes a 100 meter buffer around the county boundary. The lidar data was acquired at a nominal point spacing (NPS) of 0.7 meters and a single swath nominal point density (NPD) of 2.0. Project specifications are based on Washburn County requirements and on the U.S. Geological Survey National Geospatial Program LiDAR Base Specification, Version 1.2. The data was developed based on a horizontal projection/datum of NAD83 (2011) / WISCRS Taylor (ftUS) (EPSG Code: 7640), and vertical datum of NAVD88 - Geoid12A (Feet).

Review Information

Reviewer: | Tim Willingham | Date Delivered: | 5/31/2017

3rd Party QA Performed: ☐ | Date Assigned: | 6/6/2017

Action To Contractor Date:	Issue Description:	Return Date:
6/13/2017	See report for details	

Review Complete:
6/7/2017

Dates Project Worked:

Start: | 6/6/2017

End: | 6/7/2017

Project Materials Received

All project deliverables must be supplied according to collection and processing specifications. The USGS will postpone the QA process when any of the required deliverables are missing. When deliverables are missing, the Contracting Officer Technical Representative (COTR) will be contacted by the Elevation Section supervisor and informed of the problem. Processing will resume after the COTR has coordinated the deposition of remaining deliverables.

METADATA

Deliverables	Delivered	XML Metadata	Required	Format	Quantity	Additional Details
Collection Report:	☑		☑	*PDF*	1	
Survey Report:	☑		☑	*PDF*	1	
Processing Report:	☑		☑	*PDF*	1	
QA/QC Report:	☐		☐	*Select...*	0	
Project Level XML Metadata:	☑		☑	XML	1	
Project Extent:	☑	☐	☑	*.shp*	1	
Tile Scheme:	☑	☐	☑	*.shp*	1	
Control (Calibration) Points:	☐	☐	☐	*Select...*	0	

Check (Validation) Points:	☑	☐	☑	_.shp_	_1_	
Additional Comments:						

LIDAR DATA

Deliverables	Delivered	XML Metadata	Required	Format	Quantity	Additional Details
Swath Data:	☑	☑	☑	_.las_	_50_	
Classified/ Tiled Data:	☑	☑	☑	_.las_	_1,404_	
Additional Comments:						

DERIVED DELIVERABLES

Deliverables	Delivered	XML Metadata	Required	Format	Quantity	Additional Details
DEM Tiles:	☑	☑	☑	IMG	_1,404_	
Breaklines:	☑	☑	☑	_.shp_	_1_	
Additional Comments:						

OTHER

Additional Comments:	

Geographic Information

Area Extent: 992 _Sq. Miles_

Tile Size: 4500 x 4500 _Feet_

DEM/DTM Grid Spacing: 2 _U.S. Feet_

Coordinate Reference System:

NAD_1983_2011_WISCRS_Taylor

Projection: Lambert_Conformal_Conic

Horizontal Datum: NAD83

(2011)

○ Meters
◉ U.S. Feet
○ Int'l Feet

Vertical Datum: NAVD88

Geiod 12A

○ Meters
◉ U.S. Feet
○ Int'l Feet

THIS PROJECTION COORDINATE REFERENCE SYSTEM IS CONSISTENT ACROSS THE FOLLOWING DELIVERABLES

☑ *Project Extent*
☑ *Project Tile Scheme*
☑ *Checkpoints*
☑ *Project Level XML Metadata*

☑ *Tiled/Classified XML Metadata*
☑ *Tiled/Classified LiDAR*
☑ *Swath/Raw LiDAR XML Metadata*
☑ *Swath/Raw LiDAR*
☑ *DEM(s)*
☑ *DEM XML Metadata*
☑ *Breakline(s)*
☑ *Breakline XML Metadata*

Additional Comments:

Collection Information

Quality Level: 2
Configured Nominal Pulse Spacing:

0.69   Meters

Sensor Information:

Sensor Type:
Aerial Oscillating Mirror
Sensor Used:
Optech Orion H300
Configured Scan Angle ± from nadir:
19   *Degrees*

Additional Comments:

Metadata Review **Not Accepted**

Vendor provided metadata files have been parsed using 'mp' metadata parser. Any errors generated by the parser are documented below for reference and/or corrective action.
Parser can be found @ http://geo-nsdi.er.usgs.gov/validation/

The Project Level XML Metadata parsed without errors.

Check if 'Best Use' metadata for NED: ☐

The Swath XML Metadata parsed without errors.

Check if 'Best Use' metadata for NED: ☐

The Classified XML Metadata parsed without errors.

Check if 'Best Use' metadata for NED: ☐

The DEM XML Metadata parsed without errors.

Check if 'Best Use' metadata for NED: ☐

The Breakline XML Metadata parsed <u>without</u> errors.

Check if 'Best Use' metadata for NED: ☐

Additional Comments:	- Lasinfo PDR Format set to 1 for all xml metadata files with lasinfo. - Swath metadata class code should only be 0 - Collected, not Classified, all other values need to be removed. - Project metadata should have class code 0 and class code 1.

Based on this review, the USGS <u>does not accept</u> the xml metadata provided.

End of Metadata Review

Vertical Accuracy Review Accepted

ASPRS recommends that checkpoint surveys be used to verify the vertical accuracy of LiDAR data sets. Checkpoints are to be collected by an independent survey firm licensed in the particular state(s) where the project is located. While subjective, checkpoints should be well distributed throughout the dataset. National Standards for Spatial Data Accuracy (NSSDA) guidance states that checkpoints may be distributed more densely in the vicinity of important features and more sparsely in areas that are of little or no interest. Checkpoints should be distributed so that points are spaced at intervals of at least ten percent of the diagonal distance across the dataset and at least twenty percent of the points are located in each quadrant of the dataset.

NSSDA and ASPRS require that a minimum of twenty checkpoints (thirty is preferred) are collected for each major land cover category represented in the LiDAR data. Checkpoints should be selected on flat terrain, or on uniformly sloping terrain in all directions from each checkpoint. They should not be selected near severe breaks in slope, such as bridge abutments, edges of roads, or near river bluffs. Checkpoints are an important component of the USGS QA process. There is the presumption that the checkpoint surveys are error free and the discrepancies are attributable to the LiDAR dataset supplied.

For this dataset, USGS checked the spatial distribution of checkpoints with an emphasis on the bare-earth (open terrain) points; the number of points per class; the methodology used to collect these points; and the relationship between the data supplier and checkpoint collector. When independent control data are available, USGS has incorporated this into the analysis.

Required Vertical Accuracy

◉ *Yes* ○ *No*

REQUIRED NON-VEGETATED VERTICAL ACCURACY FOR SWATH AND DEM FILES

Required Unit:	Centimeters
Required # of checkpoints:	58
Required RMSEz:	10
*Required Vertical Accuracy (RMSEz * 95th CI)*	19.6

REQUIRED VEGETATED VERTICAL ACCURACY FOR DEM FILES

Required Unit:	Centimeters

Required # of checkpoints:	47
Required Vertical Accuracy (@ 95th percentile)	29.4

Additional Required Vertical Accuracy Information:	

Reported Vertical Accuracy

◉ *Yes* ○ *No*

REPORTED NON-VEGETATED VERTICAL ACCURACY FOR SWATH LIDAR FILES

Reported Unit:	Centimeters
Reported # of checkpoints:	58
Reported RMSEz:	4.27
Reported Vertical Accuracy (RMSEz * 95th CI)	8.4

REPORTED NON-VEGETATED VERTICAL ACCURACY FOR DEM FILES

Reported Unit:	Centimeters
Reported # of checkpoints:	58
Reported RMSEz:	4.27
Reported Vertical Accuracy (RMSEz * 95th CI)	8.4

REPORTED VEGETATED VERTICAL ACCURACY FOR DEM FILES

Reported Unit:	Centimeters
Reported # of checkpoints:	47
Reported Vertical Accuracy (95th percentile)	19.6

Additional Reported Vertical Accuracy Information:	

Reviewed Vertical Accuracy

◉ *Yes* ○ *No*

CHECKPOINT REVIEW

Checkpoints are well distributed?	☑
Enough checkpoints for task order?	☑
Checkpoints meet USGS LiDAR base-spec in quantity and quality?	☑

REVIEWED NON-VEGETATED VERTICAL ACCURACY FOR SWATH LIDAR FILES

Reviewed Unit: | Centimeters

Reviewed # of checkpoints: | 58

Reviewed RMSEz: | 4.27

Reviewed Vertical Accuracy (RMSEz * 95th CI) | 8.38

REVIEWED NON-VEGETATED VERTICAL ACCURACY FOR DEM FILES

Reviewed Unit: | Centimeters

Reviewed # of checkpoints: | 58

Reviewed RMSEz: | 4.26

Reviewed Vertical Accuracy (RMSEz * 95th CI) | 8.34

REVIEWED VEGETATED VERTICAL ACCURACY

Required Unit: | Centimeters

Required # of checkpoints: | 47

Reviewed Vertical Accuracy (95th percentile) | 19.61

Checkpoint Distribution Image

Vertical Accuracy Results:

Additional Reviewed Vertical Accuracy Information:	

Based on this review, the USGS <u>accepts</u> the vertical accuracy.

End of Vertical Accuracy Review

Raw-Swath LiDAR Review **Accepted**

LAS swath files or raw unclassified LiDAR data are reviewed to assess the quality control used by the data supplier during collection. Furthermore, LAS swath data are checked for positional accuracy. The data supplier should have calculated the Non-Vegetated Vertical Accuracy using ground control checkpoints measured in clear open terrain (*see Vertical Accuracy Review Section*).

Review Required: ● *Yes* ○ *No*

RAW-SWATH LIDAR FILE CHARACTERISTICS

☑ *Separate folder for swath/raw LiDAR files*

LAS Version: 1.4

Point Record Format: 6

If specified, *.wpd files for full waveform data have been provided:Not Required

☑ *Correct and properly formatted georeference information is included in all LAS file headers, including the use of OGC 2001 Well Known Text (WKT).*

☐ *Adjusted GPS time used with the global encoder id set to 1*

Set to 17.

Additional comments:

Based on this review, the USGS <u>accepts</u> the swath/raw LiDAR data.

End of Swath/Raw LiDAR Review

Tiled/Classified LiDAR Review **Not Accepted**

Classified LAS tile files are used to build digital terrain models using the points classified as ground. Therefore, it is important that the classified LAS are of sufficient quality to ensure that the derivative product accurately represents the landscape that was measured. Classified LAS Tiles are comprised as follows, "all project swaths, returns, and collected points, fully calibrated, adjusted to ground, and classified and cut, by tiles, excluding calibration swaths, cross-ties, and other swaths not used, or intended to be used, in product generation".

Review Required: ◉ *Yes* ○ *No*

CLASSIFIED LIDAR TILE CHARACTERISTICS

☑ *Separate folder for classified/tiled LiDAR files*

LAS Version: <u>1.4</u>

Point Record Format: <u>6</u>

*If specified, *.wpd files for full waveform data have been provided:* <u>Not Required</u>

☑ *Classified LAS tile files conform to project tiling scheme*

☑ *Quantity of classified LAS tile files conforms to project tiling scheme*

☑ *Classified LAS tile files do not overlap*

☑ *Classified LAS tile files are uniform in size*

☑ *Correct and properly formatted georeference information is included in all LAS file headers, including the use of OGC 2001 Well Known Text (WKT).*

☐ *Adjusted GPS time used with the global encoder id set to 1*

Set to 17.

☑ *Classified LAS tile files have no points classified as '12' (Overlap) and correctly use overlap bit.*

☐ *Point classifications are limited to the standard values listed below:*

Code	Description	Used
1	Processed, but unclassified	☑
2	Bare-earth/Ground	☑
7	Noise (low, manually identified, if needed)	☑
8	Model key points	☐
9	Water	☑
10	Ignored ground (breakline proximity)	☑
11	Withheld (if the "Withheld Bit" is not implemented in the processing software	☐
17	Bridges	☑
18	Noise (high, manually identified, if needed)	☑

Additional comments:

- Classified Las files have 2 Spatial Reverence VLR's. They can only have 1 Spatial Reference VLR.

Based on this review, the USGS _does not accept_ classified/tiled LiDAR data.

End of Tiled/Classified LiDAR Review

Breakline Review Accepted
Breaklines are vector feature classes that are used to hydro-flatten the bare earth Digital Elevation Models.

Review Required: ◉ *Yes* ○ *No*

BREAKLINE FILE CHARACTERISTICS:

☑ Separate folder for breakline files.

☑ Breaklines contain elevation values.

Elevation values stored in <u>Geometery (ZEnabled)</u>   .

Units: <u>U.S. Feet</u>

☑ Waterbody Breaklines.

Polyline ☑ Polygon ☐

☐ Single elevation value per waterbody feature.

☑ Required.

Waterbody Elevations were created via <u>Unknown</u>   waterbody level techniques.

☑ Double Line Stream Breaklines (Streams Approximately > 100 ft).

Polyline ☑ Polygon ☐

Downstream DLS Flow is <u>Monotonic</u>   .

☑ Required.

☐ Single Line Breaklines.

☐ No missing or misplaced breaklines.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS, ERRORS, ANOMALIES, OR OTHER ISSUES:

- There are 14 breaklines outside the AOI. See Errors shapefile.
Examples:

Based on this review, the USGS <u>accepts</u> the breakline files.

End of Breakline Review

DEM Review Not Accepted

The derived bare-earth file(s) receive a review of the vertical accuracies provided by the data supplier, vertical accuracies calculated by the USGS using supplied and independent checkpoints (*see the prior Vertical Accuracy Review Section*), and a thorough visual review for any anomalies or inconsistencies in assessing the quality of the DEM(s).

BARE-EARTH DEM TILE CHARACTERISTICS:

☑ Separate folder for bare-earth DEM files

Raster File Type: <u>IMG</u>

Raster Cell Size: 2   <u>U.S. Feet</u>

Tile bit depth/pixel Type: 32_BIT_FLOAT

Interpolation or Resampling Technique: <u>Unknown</u>

☑ DEM tiles do not overlap
☑ DEM tiles conform to Project Tiling Scheme
☑ Quantity of DEM files conforms to Project Tiling Scheme
☑ DEM tiles are uniform in size

☑ DEM tiles properly edge match and free of edge artifacts
☑ Tiles are free from Spikes and Pits
☑ Tiles are free from Data Holidays (*voids due to processing or collection errors*)
☑ Tiles do not exhibit systematic sensor error or cornrowing

Hydro Treatment: <u>hydro-flattened</u>

DEM tiles are properly Hydro Flattened ⦿ Yes ○ No

☐ Waterbodies 2 Acres   or greater are flattened

- 20 Waterbodies need to be hydroflattened, hydroflattened correctly or hydroflattened correctly. See Error shapefile. Examples:

- 1 Waterbody with floating water. See Error shapefile.

☑ Streams 100 ft. or greater are flattened in a downstream manner
☑ Tidal Boundaries/Shorelines are flattened

☑ No missing islands 1 Acre or larger
☑ Bridges/Overpasses are properly removed
☑ Culverts are maintained (Not Hydro Enforced)
☑ Depressions, Sinks, are not filled in (Not Hydro Conditioned)
☑ Vegetation properly removed
☑ Manmade structures properly removed

Tiles recommended for NED 1/3rd: ○ Yes. ● No.
Tiles recommended for NED 1/9th: ○ Yes. ○ No.
Tiles recommended for NED 1 Meter: ○ Yes. ● No.
LAS dataset recommended for distribution: Select...

Based on this review, the USGS <u>does not accept</u> the DEM tiles.

End of DEM Review

Based on this review, the provided delivery <u>Does Not Meet</u> the Contract and/or Task Order requirements.

Additional Comments:

INTERNAL COMMENTS

END OF REPORT (v2.4.0)