Hyde County – Tar-Pamlico Basin

The preliminary checkpoint spreadsheets were received from NCGS on October 17, 2001. Two spreadsheets were included for each county, which compared the independent QA/QC survey checkpoints with the interpolated LIDAR "Z" value as provided by the contractors. The spreadsheet summaries included:

1. All the checkpoints with the RMSE calculation for combined land cover
2. 95% of the checkpoints with the RMSE calculation (5% of points having the largest error removed)

All data was reviewed and further analyzed to assess the quality of the data. The review process examined the statistics for the combined land cover and the trends for each specific land cover type. The following graphs and figures illustrate the data quality as per the RMSE criteria.

Table 1 summarizes the RMSE using:

- 100% of the checkpoints
- 95% of the checkpoints
- Checkpoints categorized by land cover type

Table 1. RMSE by Land Class

%	RMSE (cm)	# of Points	Land Class	RMSE Criteria (cm)
100	24.2	120	All	
95	**14.5**	**114**	**All**	**20**
23	11.1	27	Grass	
10	13.0	12	Weeds/Crop	
21	16.1	25	Scrub	
23	18.1	28	Forest	
18	11.5	22	Built-up	

The LIDAR data for Hyde County meets specification as per the RMSE criteria of 20 cm.

All figures represent the data with the 95% data set. The data is of good quality within all land cover types.

Figure 1 illustrates the RMSE by specific land cover type.



Figure 1

Figure 2 illustrates the magnitude of the differences between the checkpoints and LIDAR data by specific land cover type and sorted from lowest to highest.



Figure 2

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

Table 2. Elevation Delta	
Delta (cm)	**Land Cover**
-35.3	Grass
-22.9	Grass
-18.9	Grass
-16.4	Grass
-15.5	Grass
-10.5	Grass
-10.4	Grass
-7.5	Grass
-6.8	Grass
-6.5	Grass
-4.2	Grass
-3.1	Grass
-3.0	Grass
-2.6	Grass
-1.6	Grass
-1.6	Grass
-1.4	Grass
-1.0	Grass
-0.8	Grass
-0.1	Grass
0.5	Grass
0.8	Grass
4.3	Grass
5.7	Grass
5.9	Grass
9.9	Grass
10.9	Grass
-23.0	Weeds/Crop
-22.3	Weeds/Crop
-20.8	Weeds/Crop
-13.9	Weeds/Crop
-12.5	Weeds/Crop
-10.8	Weeds/Crop
-6.4	Weeds/Crop
-5.3	Weeds/Crop
-4.4	Weeds/Crop
-2.9	Weeds/Crop
-2.1	Weeds/Crop
3.4	Weeds/Crop
-30.4	Scrub
-28.4	Scrub
-23.5	Scrub
-23.0	Scrub
-20.8	Scrub
-20.7	Scrub
-19.3	Scrub
-18.0	Scrub
-17.7	Scrub
-16.2	Scrub
-16.1	Scrub
-12.5	Scrub
-12.0	Scrub
-11.4	Scrub
-11.0	Scrub
-7.7	Scrub
-6.9	Scrub
-6.4	Scrub
-5.3	Scrub
-2.0	Scrub
-1.6	Scrub
2.0	Scrub
3.9	Scrub
4.1	Scrub
22.9	Scrub
-37.0	Forest
-30.3	Forest
-29.2	Forest
-24.2	Forest
-22.8	Forest
-22.5	Forest
-21.7	Forest
-21.3	Forest
-19.7	Forest
-15.6	Forest
-15.3	Forest
-11.1	Forest
-10.4	Forest
-10.1	Forest
-9.4	Forest
-8.8	Forest
-6.7	Forest
-2.5	Forest
-2.4	Forest
-1.4	Forest
-0.5	Forest
0.8	Forest
1.0	Forest
3.1	Forest
4.9	Forest
15.3	Forest
24.9	Forest
33.9	Forest
-33.1	Built-up
-17.4	Built-up
-10.6	Built-up
-9.8	Built-up
-8.3	Built-up
-7.0	Built-up
-6.2	Built-up
-5.5	Built-up
-3.9	Built-up
-3.6	Built-up
0.1	Built-up
1.0	Built-up
1.2	Built-up
1.8	Built-up
3.2	Built-up
4.1	Built-up
4.2	Built-up
5.9	Built-up
6.9	Built-up
7.4	Built-up
19.1	Built-up
23.1	Built-up

Table 3 illustrates the overall statistics for the checkpoint data.

Table 3. Overall Descriptive Statistics

	RMSE (cm)	Mean (cm)	Median (cm)	Skew	Std Dev (cm)	# of Points	Min (cm)	Max (cm)
Total	**14.5**	-7.0	-6.4	0.2	12.7	114	-37.0	33.9
Grass	**11.1**	-4.9	-2.6	-1.1	10.2	27	-35.3	10.9
Weeds/Crop	**13.0**	-10.1	-8.6	-0.3	8.6	12	-23.0	3.4
Scrub	**16.1**	-11.1	-12.0	0.8	11.9	25	-30.4	22.9
Forest	**18.1**	-8.5	-9.8	0.7	16.2	28	-37.0	33.9
Built-up	**11.5**	-1.3	0.5	-0.5	11.7	22	-33.1	23.1

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