

REGION 10

Iligan, Mandulog, and Agus River Flood Plain:

DREAM LiDAR Data Acquisition
and Processing Report



TRAINING CENTER FOR APPLIED GEODESY AND PHOTOGRAMMETRY

2015



© University of the Philippines and the Department of Science and Technology 2015

Published by the UP Training Center for Applied Geodesy and Photogrammetry (TCAGP)
College of Engineering
University of the Philippines, Diliman
Quezon City
1101 PHILIPPINES

This research work is supported by the Department of Science and Technology (DOST) Grants-in-Aid Program and is to be cited as:

UP-TCAGP (2015), DREAM LiDAR Data Acquisition and Processing for Iligan, Mandulog, and Agus River Floodplain, Disaster Risk and Exposure Assessment for Mitigation (DREAM) Program, DOST Grants-In-Aid Program, 62pp.

The text of this information may be copied and distributed for research and educational purposes with proper acknowledgment. While every care is taken to ensure the accuracy of this publication, the UP TCAGP disclaims all responsibility and all liability (including without limitation, liability in negligence) and costs which might incur as a result of the materials in this publication being inaccurate or incomplete in any way and for any reason.

For questions/queries regarding this report, contact:

Engr. Czar Jakiri S. Sarmiento, MSRS

Project Leader, Data Acquisition Component, DREAM Program
University of the Philippines Diliman
Quezon City, Philippines 1101
Email: czarjakiri@gmail.com

Engr. Ma. Rosario Concepcion O. Ang, MSRS

Project Leader, Data Processing Component, DREAM Program
University of the Philippines Diliman
Quezon City, Philippines 1101
Email: concon.ang@gmail.com

Enrico C. Paringit, Dr. Eng.

Program Leader, DREAM Program
University of the Philippines Diliman
Quezon City, Philippines 1101
E-mail: paringit@gmail.com

National Library of the Philippines
ISBN: 978-621-9695-08-0



Table of Contents

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	About the DREAM Program	2
1.2	Objectives and Target Outputs	2
1.3	General Methodological Framework	3
2.	STUDY AREA	5
3.	METHODOLOGY	9
3.1	Acquisition Methodology	10
3.1.1	Pre-Site Preparation	10
3.1.1.1	Creation of Flight Plans	10
3.1.1.2	Collection of Existing Reference Points and Benchmarks	12
3.1.1.3	Preparation of Field Plan	12
3.1.2	Ground Base Set-up	14
3.1.3	Acquisition of Digital Elevation Data (LiDAR Survey)	14
3.1.4	Transmittal of Acquired LiDAR Data	14
3.1.5	Equipment (ALTM Pegasus)	15
3.2	Processing Methodology	16
3.2.1	Data Transfer	17
3.2.2	Trajectory Computation	18
3.2.3	LiDAR Point Cloud Rectification	18
3.2.4	LiDAR Data Quality Checking	19
3.2.5	LiDAR Point Cloud Classification and Rasterization	22
3.2.6	DEM Editing and Hydro-correction	25
4.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	27
4.1	LiDAR Data Acquisition in Mandulog, Iligan and Agus Floodplains	28
4.1.1	Flight Plans	28
4.1.2	Ground Base Station	30
4.2	LiDAR Data Processing	34
4.2.1	Trajectory Computation	34
4.2.2	LiDAR Point Cloud Computation	37
4.2.3	LiDAR Data Quality Checking	38
4.2.4	LiDAR Point Cloud Classification and Rasterization	43
4.2.5	DEM Editing and Hydro-correction	47
5.	ANNEX	55
	Annex A. Optech Technical Specification Of The Pegasus Sensor	56
	Annex B. Optech Technical Specification Of The D-8900 Aerial Digital Camera	57
	Annex C. The Survey Team	58
	Annex D. Namria Certification For Ldn-01	59
	Annex E. Data Transfer Sheet	60
	Annex G. Flight Logs	61
1.	Flight Log for 1AGU117B Mission	61
2.	Flight Log for 1AGUS118A Mission	62



List of Figures

Figure 1.	The General Methodological Framework Of The Program	3
Figure 2.	Mandulog River Basin Location Map	6
Figure 3.	Mandulog River Basin Soil Map	7
Figure 4.	Mandulog River Basin Land Cover Map	7
Figure 5.	Flowchart Of Project Methodology	10
Figure 6.	Concept Of Lidar Data Acquisition Parameters	11
Figure 7.	Lidar Data Management For Transmittal	15
Figure 8.	The ALTM Pegasus System: A) Parts Of The Pegasus System, B) The System As Installed In Cessna T206h	16
Figure 9.	Schematic Diagram Of Data Processing	17
Figure 10.	Misalignment Of A Single Roof Plane From Two Adjacent Flight Lines, Before Rectification (Left). Least Squares Adjusted Roof- Plane, After Rectification (Right)	19
Figure 11.	Elevation Difference Between Flight Lines Generated From Lastools	20
Figure 12.	Profile Over Roof Planes (A) And A Zoomed-In Profile On The Area Encircled In Yellow (B)	21
Figure 13.	Ground Classification Technique Employed In Terrascan	22
Figure 14.	Resulting Dtm Of Ground Classification Using The Default Parameters (A) And Adjusted Parameters (B)	23
Figure 15.	Default Terrascan Building Classification Parameters	24
Figure 16.	Different examples of air points manually detected in the Terrascan window	24
Figure 17.	Mandulog, Iligan And Agus Flood Plains Flight Plans	29
Figure 18.	Namria Control Station Ldn-01 Is Located On The Rooftop Of Philippine Ports Authority Building In Iligan City	30
Figure 19.	Mandulog, Iligan And Agus Flood Plains Flight Plan And Base Station	31
Figure 20.	Mandulog And Iligan Flood Plains Data Acquisition Coverage	32
Figure 21.	Smoothed Performance Metric Parameters Of MIA 1 Flight	34
Figure 22.	Solution Status Parameters Of Mia 1 Flight	35
Figure 23.	Smoothed Performance Metric Parameters Of MIA 2 Flight	36
Figure 24.	Solution Status Parameters Of MIA 2 Flight	37
Figure 25.	Coverage Of Lidar Data For The Mandulog, Iligan And Agus Mission	38
Figure 26.	Image Of Data Overlap For The Mandulog, Iligan, And Agus Mission	39
Figure 27.	Density Map Of Merged Lidar Data For The Mandulog, Iligan, And Agus Mission	40
Figure 28.	Elevation Difference Map Between Flight Lines	41
Figure 29.	Quality Checking With The Profile Tool Of Qt Modeler For Mandulog-Iligan	42
Figure 30.	Quality Checking With The Profile Tool Of Qt Modeler For Agus	43
Figure 31.	(A) Mandulog (MIA 1) Flood Plains And (B) Mandulog (MIA 1) Classification Results In Terrascan	44
Figure 32.	(A) Iligan (MIA 2) Flood Plains And (B) Iligan (MIA 2) Classification Results In Terrascan	44



List of Figures

Figure 33.	(A) Agus Flood Plains And (B) Agus Classification Results In Terrascan	45
Figure 34.	Point Cloud (A) Before And (B) After Classification For Mandulog	46
Figure 35.	Point Cloud (A) Before And (B) After Classification For Iligan	47
Figure 36.	Point Cloud (A) Before And (B) After Classification For Agus	47
Figure 37.	Images Of DTMs For Iligan And Mandulog Before And After Manual Editing	48
Figure 38.	Images Of DTMs For Agus Flood Plain Before And After Manual Editing	49
Figure 39.	Map Of Mandulog, Iligan, And Agus River Basin With Validation Survey Shown In Blue	50
Figure 40.	One-One Correlation Plot Between Topographic And Lidar Data For (A) Mandulog And (B) Iligan And (C) Agus	51
Figure 41.	Final DTM Of (A) Mandulog, (B) Iligan, And (C) Agus With Validation Survey Shown In Blue	53
Figure 42.	Final Dsm In Agus, Mandulog And Iligan	53
Figure 43.	Sample 1X1 Square Kilometer Dsm	54
Figure 44.	Sample 1X1 Square Kilometer Dtm	54



List of Tables

Table 1.	Relevant Lidar Parameters	11
Table 2.	List Of Target River Systems In The Philippines	13
Table 3.	Smoothed Solution Status Parameters On Pospac MMS v6.2	18
Table 4.	Parameters Investigated During Quality Checks	20
Table 5.	Ground Classification Parameters Used In Terrascan For Floodplain And Watershed Areas	23
Table 6.	Classification Of Vegetation According To The Elevation Of Points	23
Table 7.	Parameters Used In Lidar System During Flight Acquisition	28
Table 8.	Details Of The Recovered Namria Horizontal Control Point Ldn-01 Used As Base Station For The Lidar Acquisition	30
Table 9.	Flight Missions For Lidar Data Acquisition In Mandulog, Iligan And Agus Flood Plains	33
Table 10.	Area Of Coverage (In Sq Km) Of The Lidar Data Acquisition In Mandulog, Iligan And Agus Flood Plains	33
Table 11.	Mia 1 Classification Results In Terrascan	45
Table 12.	Mia 2 Classification Results In Terrascan	46
Table 13.	Agus Classification Results In Terrascan	46
Table 14.	Statistical Values For The Calibration Of Iligan, Mandulog And Agus Flights	52



Abbreviations

ALTM	Airborne Laser Terrain Mapper
DAC	Data Acquisition Component
DEM	Digital Elevation Model
DSM	Digital Surface Model
DTM	Digital Terrain Model
DVC	Data Validation Component
FOV	Field of View
FTP	File Transfer Protocol
GPS	Global Positioning System
GNSS	Global Navigation Satellite System
POS	Position Orientation System
PRF	Pulse Repetition Frequency
NAMRIA	National Mapping and Resource Information Authority





Introduction

Introduction

1.1 About the DREAM Program

The UP Training Center for Applied Geodesy and Photogrammetry (UP TCAGP) conducts a research program entitled “Nationwide Disaster Risk and Exposure Assessment for Mitigation (DREAM) Program” funded by the Department of Science and Technology (DOST) Grants-in-Aid Program. The DREAM Program aims to produce detailed, up-to-date, national elevation dataset for 3D flood and hazard mapping to address disaster risk reduction and mitigation in the country.

The DREAM Program consists of four components that operationalize the various stages of implementation. The Data Acquisition Component (DAC) conducts aerial surveys to collect Light Detecting and Ranging (LiDAR) data and aerial images in major river basins and priority areas. The Data Validation Component (DVC) implements ground surveys to validate acquired LiDAR data, along with bathymetric measurements to gather river discharge data. The Data Processing Component (DPC) processes and compiles all data generated by the DAC and DVC. Finally, the Flood Modeling Component (FMC) utilizes compiled data for flood modeling and simulation.

Overall, the target output is a national elevation dataset suitable for 1:5000 scale mapping, with 50 centimeter horizontal and vertical accuracies. These accuracies are achieved through the use of state-of-the-art airborne Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) technology and appended with Synthetic-aperture radar (SAR) in some areas. It collects point cloud data at a rate of 100,000 to 500,000 points per second, and is capable of collecting elevation data at a rate of 300 to 400 square kilometers per day, per sensor.

1.2 Objectives and Target Outputs

The program aims to achieve the following objectives:

- a) To acquire a national elevation and resource dataset at sufficient resolution to produce information necessary to support the different phases of disaster management;
- b) To operationalize the development of flood hazard models that would produce updated and detailed flood hazard maps for the major river systems in the country;
- c) To develop the capacity to process, produce and analyze various proven and potential thematic map layers from the 3D data useful for government agencies;
- d) To transfer product development technologies to government agencies with geospatial information requirements, and;
- e) To generate the following outputs:
 - 1) flood hazard map
 - 2) digital surface model
 - 3) digital terrain model and
 - 4) orthophotograph



Introduction

1.3 General Methodological Framework

The methodology employed to accomplish the project's expected outputs are subdivided into four (4) major components, as shown in Figure 1. Each component is described in detail in the following sections.




Figure 1. The General Methodological Framework of the Program



Study Area

Study Area

The area for the flood development in this study is the Mandulog River Basin located in Northern Mindanao. The basin is as shown in Figure 2. It covers an estimated basin area of 791 square kilometers and flows in the northwest direction. It traverses through Iligan and the municipalities of Lanao del Sur and Misamis Oriental.




Figure 2. Mandulog River Basin Location Map

Some of the important parameters to be used in the characterization of the river basin (e.g., Manning's coefficient – a representation of the variable flow of water in different land covers) are the land cover and soil use. The shape files of the soil and land cover were taken from the Bureau of Soils, which is under the Department of Environment and Natural Resources Management, and National Mapping and Resource Information Authority (NAMRIA). The land and soil cover of Mandulog River Basin are as shown in Figure 3 and Figure 4.



Study Area




Figure 3. Mandulog River Basin Soil Map




Figure 4. Mandulog River Basin Land Cover Map



Methodology

Methodology

3.1 Acquisition Methodology

The methodology employed to accomplish the project’s expected outputs are subdivided into four (4) major components, as shown in Figure 5. Each component is described in detail in the following sections.




Figure 5. Flowchart of Project Methodology

3.1.1 Pre-site Preparations

3.1.1.1 Creation of Flight Plans

Flight planning is the process of configuring the parameters of the aircraft and LiDAR system (i.e. altitude, angular field of view (FOV), speed of the aircraft, scans frequency and pulse repetition frequency) to achieve a target of two points per square meter point density for the floodplain. This ensures that areas of the floodplain that are most susceptible to floods will be covered. LiDAR parameters and their computations are shown in Table 1.

The parameters set in the LiDAR sensor to optimize the area coverage following the objectives of the project and to ensure the aircraft’s safe return to the airport (base of operations) are shown in Table 1. Each flight acquisition is designed for four operational hours. The maximum flying hours for Cessna 206H is five hours.

Methodology

Table 1. Relevant LiDAR parameters

Parameter	Formula	Description
SW (Swath Width)	$SW = 2 * H * \tan(\theta/2)$	H – altitude θ – angular FOV
Pointing Space	$\Delta X_{\text{across}} = (\theta * H) / (N \cos^2(\theta/2))$	ΔX_{across} – point spacing across the flight line H – altitude θ – angular FOV N – number of points in one scanning line
	$\Delta X_{\text{along}} = v / fsc$	ΔX_{along} – point spacing along the flight line v – forward speed (m/s) fsc – scanning rate or scan frequency
Point density, d_{min}	$d_{\text{min}} = 1 / (\Delta X_{\text{across}} * \Delta X_{\text{along}})$	ΔX_{across} , ΔX_{along} point spacings
Flight line separation, e	$e = SW * (1 - \text{overlapping factor})$	SW – swath width
# of flight lines, n	$n = w / [(1 - \text{overlap}) * SW]$	w – width of the map that will be produce in meters. The direction of flights will be perpendicular to the width.




Figure 6. Concept of LiDAR data acquisition parameters

The relationship among altitude, swath, and FOV is shown in Figure 6. Given the altitude of the survey (H) and the angular FOV, the survey coverage for each pass (swath) can be calculated by doubling the product of altitude and tangent of half the field of view.

Methodology

3.1.1.2 Collection of Existing Reference Points and Benchmarks

Collection of pertinent technical data, available information, and coordination with the National Mapping and Resource Information Authority (NAMRIA) is conducted prior to the surveys. Reference data collected includes locations and descriptions of horizontal and vertical control (elevation benchmarks) points within or near the project area. These control points are used as base stations for the aerial survey operations. Base stations are observed simultaneously with the acquisition flights.

3.1.1.3 Preparation of Field Plan

In preparation for the field reconnaissance and actual LiDAR data acquisition, a field plan is prepared by the implementation team. The field plan serves as a guide for the actual fieldwork and included personnel, logistical, financial, and technical details. Three major factors are included in field plan preparation: priority areas for the major river basin system; budget; and accommodation and vehicle rental.

LiDAR data are acquired for the floodplain area of the river system as per order of priority based on history of flooding, loss of lives, and damages of property. The order of priority in which LiDAR data surveys are conducted by the team for the floodplain areas of the 18 major river systems and 3 additional systems is shown in Table 2.

Methodology

Table 2. List of Target River Systems in the Philippines

	Target River System	Location	Area of the River System (km ²)	Area of the Flood Plain (km ²)	Area of the Watershed (km ²)
1	Cagayan de Oro	Mindanao	1,364	25	1,338.51
1.1	Iponan	Mindanao	438	33	404.65
2	Mandulog	Mindanao	714	7	707.41
2.1	Iligan	Mindanao	153	7	146.38
2.2	Agus	Mindanao	1,918	16	1,901.60
3	Pampanga	Luzon	11,160	4458	6702
4	Agno	Luzon	6,220	1725	4495
5	Bicol	Luzon	3,173	585	2,587.79
6	Panay	Visayas	2,442	619	1823
7	Jalaur	Visayas	2,105	713	1,392
8	Ilog Hilbangan	Visayas	2,146	179	1967
9	Magasawang Tubig	Luzon	1,960	483	1,477.08
10	Agusan	Mindanao	11,814	262	11,551.62
11	Tagoloan	Mindanao	1,753	30	1,722.90
12	Davao	Mindanao	1,609	54	1555
13	Tagum	Mindanao	2,504	595	1,909.23
14	Buayan	Mindanao	1,589	201	1,388.21
15	Mindanao	Mindanao	20,963	405	20,557.53
16	Lucena	Luzon	238	49	189.31
17	Infanta	Luzon	1,029	90	938.61
18	Boracay	Visayas	43.34	43.34	N/A
19	Cagayan	Luzon	28,221	10386	17,835.14

Methodology

3.1.2 Ground Base Set-up

A reconnaissance is conducted one day before the actual LiDAR survey for purposes of recovering control point monuments on the ground and site visits of the survey area set in the flight plan for the floodplain. Coordination meetings with the Airport Manager, regional DOST office, local government units and other concerned line government agencies are also held.

Ground base stations are established within 30-kilometer radius of the corresponding survey area in the flight plan. This enables the system to establish its position in three-dimensional (3D) space so that the acquired topographic data will have an accurate 3D position since the survey required simultaneous observation with a base station on the ground using terrestrial Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS) receivers.

3.1.3 Acquisition of Digital Elevation Data (LiDAR Survey)

Acquisition of LiDAR data is done by following the flight plans. The survey uses a LiDAR instrument mounted on the aircraft with its sensor positioned through a specially modified peep hole on the belly of the aircraft. The pilots are guided by the flight guidance software which uses the data out of the flight planning program with a mini-display at the pilot's cockpit showing the aircraft's real-time position relative to the current survey flight line. The reference points established by NAMRIA are also monitored and used to calibrate the data.

As the system collected LiDAR data, ranges and intensities are recorded on hard drives dedicated to the system while the images are stored on the camera hard drive. Position Orientation System (POS) data is recorded on the POS computer inside the control rack. It can only be accessed and downloaded via file transfer protocol (ftp) to the laptop computer. GPS observations were downloaded each day for efficient data management.

3.1.4 Transmittal of Acquired LiDAR Data

All data surrendered are monitored, inspected and re-checked by securing a data transfer checklist signed by the downloader (Data Acquisition Component) and the receiver (Data Processing Component). The data transfer checklist shall include the following: date of survey, mission name, flight number, disk size of the necessary data (LAS, LOGS, POS, Images, Mission Log File, Range, Digitizer and the Base Station), and the data directory within the server. Figure 7 shows the arrangement of folders inside the data server.



Methodology




Figure 7. LiDAR Data Management for transmittal

3.1.5 Equipment (ALTM Pegasus)

The ALTM Pegasus (Optech, Inc) is a laser based system suitable for topographic survey (Figure 8). It has a dual output laser system for maximum density capability. The LiDAR system is equipped with an Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU) and GPS for geo-referencing of the acquired data (Annex A contains the technical specification of the system).

The camera of the Pegasus sensor is tightly integrated with the system. It has a footprint of 8,900 pixels across by 6,700 pixels along the flight line (Annex B contains the technical specification of the D-8900 aerial digital camera).

Methodology



Figure 8. The ALTM Pegasus System: a) parts of the Pegasus system, b) the system as installed in Cessna T206H

3.2 Processing Methodology

The schematic diagram of the workflow implemented by the Data Processing Component (DPC) is shown in Figure 9. The raw data collected by the Data Acquisition Component (DAC) is transferred to DPC. Pre-processing of this data starts with the computation of trajectory and georectification of point cloud, in which the coordinates of the LiDAR point cloud data are adjusted and checked for gaps and shifts, using POSpac, LMS, LAStools and Quick Terrain (QT) Modeler software.

The unclassified LiDAR data then undergoes point cloud classification, which allows cleaning of noise data that are not necessary for further processing, using TerraScan software. The classified point cloud data in ASCII format is used to generate a data elevation model (DEM), which is edited and calibrated with the use of validation and bathymetric survey data collected from the field by the Data Validation and Bathymetry Component (DVBC). The final DEM is then used by the Flood Modeling Component (FMC) to generate the flood models for different flooding scenarios.

Methodology




Figure 9. Schematic diagram of the data processing

3.2.1 Data Transfer

The Mandulog, Iligan and Agus missions, named 1AGU1A117B and 1AGU1B118A, were flown with the Airborne LiDAR Terrain Mapper (ALTM™ Optech Inc.) by Pegasus system on April 27 – 28, 2013. For the 1AGU1B118A mission, the Data Acquisition Component (DAC) transferred 9.91 Gigabytes of range data, 155 Megabytes of POS data, 9.89 Megabytes of GPS base station data, and 16.5 Gigabytes of raw image data to the data server on May 2, 2013.

On the other hand, for the 1AGU1A117B mission, DAC transferred 20.6 Gigabytes of range data, 335 Megabytes of POS data, 18.61 Megabytes of GPS base station data, and 41.8 Gigabytes of raw image data to the data server on May 10, 2013.

Methodology

3.2.2 Trajectory Computation

The trajectory of the aircraft is computed using the software POSPAC MMS v6.2. It combines the POS data from the integrated GPS/INS system installed on the aircraft, and the Rinex data from the GPS base station located within 25 kilometers of the area. It then computes the Smoothed Best Estimated Trajectory (SBET) file, which contains the best estimated trajectory of the aircraft, and the Smoothed Root Mean Square Estimation error file (SMRMSG), which contains the corresponding standard deviations of the position parameters of the aircraft at every point on the computed trajectory.

The key parameters checked to evaluate the performance of the trajectory are the Solution Status parameters and the Smoothed Performance Metrics parameters. The Solution Status parameters characterize the GPS satellite geometry and baseline length at the time of acquisition, and the processing mode used by POSPAC. The acceptable values for each Solution Status parameter are shown in Table 3.

The Smoothed Performance Metrics parameters describe the root mean square error (RMSE) for the north, east and down (vertical) position of the aircraft for each point in the computed trajectory. A RMSE value of less than 4 cm for the north and east position is acceptable, while a value of less than 8 cm is acceptable for the down position.

Table 3. Smoothed Solution Status parameters in POSPAC MMS v6.2

Parameter	Optimal Value
Number of satellites	More than 6 satellites
Position Dilution of Precision	Less than 3
Baseline Length	Less than 30 km
Processing mode	Less than or equal to 1, however short bursts of values greater than 1 are acceptable

3.2.3 LiDAR Point Cloud Rectification

The trajectory file (SBET) and its corresponding accuracy file (SMRMSG) generated in POSPAC are merged with the Range file to compute the coordinates of each individual point. The coordinates of points within the overlap region of contiguous strips vary due to small deviations in the trajectory computation for each strip. These strip misalignments are corrected by matching points from overlapping laser strips. This is done by the Lidar Mapping Suite (LMS) software developed by Optech.

LMS is a LiDAR software package used for automated LiDAR rectification. It has the capability to extract planar features per flight line and to form correspondence among the identical planes available in the overlapping areas (illustrated in Figure 10). In order to produce geometrically correct point cloud, the redundancy in the overlapping areas of flight lines is used to determine the necessary corrections for the observations.



Methodology




Figure 10. Misalignment of a single roof plane from two adjacent flight lines, before rectification (left). Least squares adjusted roof plane, after rectification (right)

The orientation parameters are corrected in LMS by using least squares adjustment to obtain the best-fit parameters and improve the accuracy of the LiDAR data. The primary indicators of the LiDAR rectification accuracy are the standard deviations of the corrections of the orientation parameters. These values are seen on the BoreSight corrections, GPS position corrections, and IMU attitude corrections, all of which are located on the LMS processing summary report. Optimum accuracy is obtained if the BoreSight and IMU attitude correction standard deviations are less than 0.001°, and if the GPS position standard deviations are below 0.01 m.

3.2.4 LiDAR Data Quality Checking

After the orientation parameters are corrected and the point cloud coordinates are computed, the entire point cloud data undergoes quality checking, to see if: (a) there are remaining horizontal and vertical misalignments between contiguous strips, and; (b) to check if the density of the point cloud data reach the target density for the site. The LAsTools software is used to compute for the elevation difference in the overlaps between strips and the point cloud density. It is a software package developed by Rapidlasso GmbH for filtering, tiling, classifying, rasterizing, triangulating and quality checking Terabytes of LiDAR data, using robust algorithms, efficient I/O tools and memory management. LAsTools can quickly create raster representing the computed quantities, which provide guiding images in determining areas where further quality checks are necessary. The target requirements for floodplain acquisition, computed by LAsTools, are shown in Table 4.

Methodology

Table 4. Parameters investigated during quality checks.

Criteria	Requirement
Minimum per cent overlap	25%
Average point cloud density per square meter	2.0
Elevation difference between strips (on flat areas)	0.20 meters

LAStools can provide guides where elevation differences probably exceed the 20 cm limit. An example of LAStools output raster visualizing points in the flight line overlaps with a vertical difference of +/- 20 cm (displayed as dense red/blue areas) is shown in Figure 11.




Figure 11. Elevation difference between flight lines generated from LAStools

To investigate the occurrences of elevation differences in finer detail, the profiling tool of Quick Terrain Modeler software is used. Quick Terrain Modeler (QT Modeler) is a 3D point cloud and terrain visualization software package developed by Applied Imagery, Inc. The profiling capability of QT Modeler is illustrated in Figure 12.

Methodology




Figure 12. Profile over roof planes (a) and a zoomed-in profile on the area encircled in yellow (b)

The profile (e.g., over a roof plane) shows the overlapping points from different flight lines which serve as a good indicator that the correction applied by LMS for individual flight lines is good enough to attain the desired horizontal and vertical accuracy requirements. Flight lines that do not pass quality checking are subject for reprocessing in LMS until desired accuracies are obtained.

Methodology

3.2.5 LiDAR Point Cloud Classification and Rasterization

Point cloud classification commences after the point cloud data has been rectified. TerraScan is a TerraSolid LiDAR software suite used for the classification of point clouds. It can read airborne and vehicle-based laser data in raw laser format, LAS, TerraScan binary or other ASCII-survey formats. Its classification and filtering routines are optimized by dividing the whole data into smaller geographical datasets called blocks, to automate the workflow and increase efficiency. In this study, the blocks were set to 1 km by 1 km with a 50 m buffer zone to prevent edge effects.

The process includes the classification of all points into Ground, Low Vegetation, Medium Vegetation, High Vegetation and Buildings. The classifier tool in TerraScan first filters air points and low points by finding points that are 5 standard deviations away from the median elevation of a search radius, which is 5 meters by default. It then divides the region into 60 m by 60m search areas (the maximum area where at least one laser point hits the ground) and assigns the lowest points in these areas as the initial ground points from which a triangulated ground model is derived. The classifier then iterates through all the points and adds the points to the ground model by testing if it is (a) within the maximum iteration angle of 4° by default from a triangle plane, and (b) if it is within the maximum iteration distance (1.2 m by default) from a triangle plane. The ground plane is continuously updated from these iterations. The ground classification technique is illustrated in Figure 13. It is apparent that the smaller the iteration angle, the less eager the classifier is to follow changes in the point cloud (small undulations in terrain or hits on low vegetation). An angle close to 4° is used in flat terrain areas while an angle of 10° is used in mountainous or hilly terrains.




Figure 13. Ground classification technique employed in TerraScan

The parameters for ground classification routines used in floodplain and watershed areas are listed in Table 5.

Methodology

Table 5. Ground classification parameters used in Terrascan for floodplain and watershed areas

Classification maximums	Floodplain (default)	Watershed (adjusted)
Iteration angle (degrees)	4	8
Iteration distance (meters)	1.20	1.50

The comparison between the produced DTM using the default parameters versus the adjusted is shown in Figure 14. The default parameters may fail to capture the sudden change in the terrain, resulting to less points being classified as ground that makes the DTM interpolated (Figure 14a). The adjusted parameters work better in these spatial conditions as shown in Figure 14b. Statistically, the number of ground points and model key points correctly classified can increase by as much as fifty percent (50%) when using the adjusted parameters.




Figure 14. Resulting DTM of ground classification using the default parameters (a) and adjusted parameters (b)

The classification to Low, Medium and High vegetation is a straightforward testing of how high a point is from the ground model. The range of elevation values and its corresponding classification is shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Classification of Vegetation according to the elevation of points

Elevation of points (meters)	Classification
0.05 to 0.15	Low Vegetation
0.15 to 2.50	Medium Vegetation
2.50 to 50.0	High Vegetation

Methodology

The classification to Buildings routine tests points above two meters (2.0 m) if they only have one echo, and if they form a planar surface of at least 40 square meters with points adjacent to them. Minimum size and Z tolerance are the parameters used in the classify buildings routine as shown in Figure 15.




Figure 15. Default TerraScan building classification parameters

Minimum size is set to the smallest building footprint size of 40 m² while the Z tolerance of 20 cm is the approximate elevation accuracy of the laser points.

The point cloud data are examined for possible occurrences of air points which are to be deleted manually in the TerraScan window. Air points are defined as groups of points which are significantly higher or lower from the ground points. The different examples of air points are shown in Figure 16.




Figure 16. Different examples of air points manually deleted in the TerraScan window

Methodology

The noise data can be as negligible as shown in Figure 16a or can be as severe as the one shown in Figure 16c. A combination of cloud points and shower of short ranges is displayed in Figure 16b. Shower of short ranges are caused by signal interference from the radio transmission of the tower and the aircraft. During every transmission on a specific frequency (around 120MHz), the signal is getting distorted due to the interference causing showers of short ranges in the output LAS.

Classified LiDAR point clouds that are free of air points, noise and unwanted data are processed in TerraScan to produce Digital Terrain Model (DTM) and the corresponding first and last return Digital Surface Models (DSM). These ground models are produced in the American Standard Code for Information Interchange format (ASCII) format. DTMs are produced by rasterizing all points classified to ground and model key points in a 1 m by 1 m grid. The last return DSMs are produced by rasterizing all last returns from all classifications (Ground, Model Key Points, Low, Medium, High Vegetation, Buildings and Default) in a 1 m by 1 m grid. The first return DSMs on the other hand are produced by rasterizing all first returns from all classifications. Power lines are usually included in this model. All of these ground models are used in the mosaicking, manual editing and hydro correction of the topographic dataset, in preparation for the floodplain hydraulic modelling.

3.2.6 DEM Editing and Hydro-correction

Even though the parameters of the classification routines are optimized, various digital elevation models (DTM, first and last return DSM) that are automatically produced may still display minor errors that still need manual correction to make the DEMs suitable for fine-scale flood modelling. This is true especially for features that are under heavy canopy. Natural embankments on the side of the river might be flattened or misrepresented because no point pierced the canopy on that area. The same difficulty might also occur on smaller streams that are under canopy. The DTM produced might have discontinuities on these channels that might affect the flood modelling negatively. Manual inspection and correction are still very important parts of quality checking the LiDAR DEMs produced.

To correctly portray the dynamics of the flow of water on the floodplain, the river geometry must also be taken into consideration. The LiDAR data must be made consistent to the topographic surveys done for the area, and the bathymetric data must be “burned”, or integrated, into the DEM to make the dataset suitable for hydraulic analyses. However, no cross-sectional survey was performed for this area.



Results and Discussion

Results and Discussion

4.1 LiDAR Data Acquisition in Mandulog, Iligan, and Agus Floodplains

4.1.1 Flight Plans

Plans were made to acquire LiDAR data within the flood plain. Each flight mission had an average of 10 flight lines and ran for at most 2 hours including take-off, landing and turning time. The parameter used in the LiDAR system for acquisition is found in Table 7.

Table 7. Parameters used in LiDAR System during Flight Acquisition.

Fixed Variables	Values		
Flying Height (AGL - Above Ground Level) (m)	750m	1000 m	1200 m
Overlap	30 %	30%	30 %
Max. field of View	50	50	50
Speed of Plane (kts)	130	130	130
Turn around minutes	5	5	5
Swath	661.58 m	882 m	1058.53 m

The parameters that set in the LiDAR sensor to optimize the area coverage following the objectives of the project and to ensure the aircraft's safe return to the airport (base of operations) are shown in Table 7. Each flight acquisition is designed for four operational hours. The maximum flying hours for Cessna 206H is five hours.



Results and Discussion




Figure 17. Mandulog, Iligan and Agus flood plains flight plans

Results and Discussion

4.1.2 Ground Base Station

The project team used the NGW-102 GCP located in Toyuman Bridge in Himamaylan City in Negros Occidental, Philippines. The certification for the base station is found in Annex D. The ground control point (GCP) was used as reference point during flight operations using TRIM-BLE SPS R8, a dual frequency GPS receiver.

Table 8. Details of the recovered NAMRIA horizontal control point LDN-01 use as base station for the LiDAR Acquisition

Station Name	LDN-01	
Order of Accuracy	3 rd	
Relative Error (horizontal positioning)	1 in 10,000	
Geographic Coordinates, Philippine Reference of 1992 Datum (PRS 92)	Latitude	8° 16' 17.24359"
	Longitude	124° 15' 23.87415"
	Ellipsoidal Height	3.896 meters
Grid Coordinates, Philippine Transverse Mercator Zone 5 (PTM Zone 5 PRS 92)	Easting	435436.191 meters
	Northing	910480.055 meters
Geographic Coordinates, World Geodetic System 1984 Datum (WGS 84)	Latitude	8° 16' 13.67999" North
	Longitude	124° 15' 29.30137" East
	Ellipsoidal Height	70.9595 meters
Grid Coordinates, Universal Transverse Mercator Zone 51 North (UTM 51N WGS 1984)	Easting	910289.41 meters
	Northing	635751.93 meters




Figure 18. NAMRIA control station LDN-01 is located on the roof top of Philippine Ports Authority building in Iligan City

Results and Discussion




Figure 19. Mandulog, Iligan and Agus flood plains flight plan and base station

Results and Discussion




Figure 20. Mandulog, Iligan and Agus floodplains data acquisition coverage

Results and Discussion

Two missions were conducted to complete the LIDAR Data Acquisition in Mandulog, Iligan and Agus floodplains, for a total of five hours and 45 minutes (5+45) of flying time for RP-C9022. All missions were acquired using the Pegasus LiDAR system. Table 10 shows the total area to be surveyed according to the flight plan and the total area of actual coverage per mission.

Mandulog, Iligan and Agus floodplains were surveyed by Mark Gregory Año and Jasmine Alviar from April 27-28, 2013 as shown in Table 10.

Table 9. Flight missions for LiDAR data acquisition in Mandulog, Iligan and Agus flood plains

Date Surveyed	Name	Flight Plan Area (km ²)	Surveyed Area (km ²)	Area Surveyed within the River System (km ²)	Area Surveyed Outside the River Systems (km ²)	No. of Images (Frames)	Flying Hours	
							Hours	Minutes
April 27, 2013	AGUS	58.412	64.81	43.362	21.478	353	3	0
April 28, 2013	AGUS	33.297	67.731	65.715	2.016	255	2	45

Table 10. Area of coverage (in sq km) of the LiDAR data acquisition in Mandulog, Iligan and Agus flood plains

Location	Date Surveyed	Operator	Mission Name	Flood-plain Surveyed Area (km ²)	Total Flood-plain Area (km ²)	Water-shed Surveyed Area (km ²)	Total Water-shed Area (km ²)
MANDULOG ILIGAN	April 27, 2013	J. Alviar	1AGU117B	7	7	8.189	707.41
				7	7	22.476	146.38
				2.48	16	28.247	1,901.60
AGUS	April 28, 2013	M. Año	1AGUS118A	13.52			

Results and Discussion

4.2 LiDAR Data Processing

4.2.1 Trajectory Computation




Figure 21. Smoothed Performance Metric Parameters of MIA flight

The *Smoothed Performance Metric* parameters of the M1A 1 flight are shown in Figure 21. The x-axis is the time of flight, which is measured by the number of seconds from the midnight of the start of the GPS week. The y-axis is the RMSE value for a particular position with respect to GPS survey time. The North (Figure 21a) and east (Figure 21b) position RMSE values fall within the prescribed accuracy of 4 centimeters, and all Down (Figure 21c) position RMSE values fall within the prescribed accuracy of 8 centimeters.

Results and Discussion




Figure 22. Solution Status Parameters of MIA 1 flight

The *Solution Status* parameters of the computed trajectory for flight MIA 1, which are the number of GPS satellites, Positional Dilution of Precision (PDOP), and the GPS processing mode used are shown in Figure 22. The number of GPS satellites (Figure 22a) graph indicates that the number of satellites during the acquisition was between 6 and 9. The PDOP (Figure 22b) value does not exceed the value of 3, indicating optimal GPS geometry. The processing mode (Figure 22c) stays at a value of 0, which corresponds to a Fixed, Narrow-Lane mode, which indicates an optimum solution for trajectory computation by POSpac MMS v6.2. All of the parameters satisfied the accuracy requirements for optimal trajectory solutions as indicated in the methodology.

Results and Discussion




Figure 23. Smoothed Performance Metric Parameters of MIA 2 flight

The *Smoothed Performance Metric* parameters of the MIA 2 flight are shown in Figure 23. The x-axis is the time of flight, which is measured by the number of seconds from the midnight of the start of the GPS week. The y-axis is the RMSE value for a particular aircraft position with respect to GPS survey time. The North (Figure 23a) and east (Figure 23b) position RMSE values fall within the prescribed accuracy of 4 centimeters, and all Down (Figure 23c) position RMSE values fall within the prescribed accuracy of 8 centimeters.

Results and Discussion




Figure 24. Solution Status Parameters of MIA 2 flight

The *Solution Status* parameters of the computed trajectory for the MIA 2 flight, which are the number of GPS satellites, Positional Dilution of Precision (PDOP), and the GPS processing mode used are shown in Figure 23. The number of GPS satellites (Figure 23a) graph indicates that the number of satellites during the acquisition was between 7 and 10. The PDOP value (Figure 23b) does not exceed the value of 3, indicating optimal GPS geometry. The processing mode (Figure 23c) stays at the value of 0, which corresponds to a Fixed, Narrow-Lane mode, which indicates an optimum solution for trajectory computation by POSPac MMS v6.2. All of the parameters satisfied the accuracy requirements for optimal trajectory solutions as indicated in the methodology.

4.2.2 LiDAR Point Cloud Computation

The LAS data output of MIA 1 contains 16 flight lines while that of MIA 2 produced 0 flight lines, with each flight line containing two channels, a feature of the Pegasus system. The result of the boresight correction standard deviation values for both channel 1 and channel 2 are better than the prescribed 0.001° . The position of the LiDAR system is also accurately computed since all GPS position standard deviations are less than 0.04 meter. The attitude of the LiDAR system passed accuracy testing since the standard deviation of the corrected roll and pitch values of the IMU attitudes are less than 0.001° .

Results and Discussion

4.2.3 LiDAR Data Quality Checking

The LAS boundary of the LiDAR data on top of the SRTM elevation data is shown in Figure 25. The map shows gaps in the LiDAR coverage that are attributed to cloud coverage present during the survey.




Figure 25. Coverage of LiDAR data for the Mandulog, Iligan and Agus mission

The overlap data for the merged LiDAR data showing the number of channels that pass through a particular location is shown in Figure 26. Since the Pegasus system employs two channels, an average value of 2 (blue) for areas where there are only two overlapping flight lines, and a values of 3 (yellow) or more (red) for areas with three or more overlapping flight lines, are expected. The average data overlaps for Mandulog, Iligan, and Agus are 50.73%, 40.16% and 97.87%, respectively.

Results and Discussion




Figure 26. Image of data overlap for the Mandulog, Iligan, and Agus mission

The overlap data for the merged LiDAR data showing the number of channels that pass through a particular location is shown in Figure 26. Since the Pegasus system employs two channels, an average value of 2 (blue) for areas where there are only two overlapping flight lines, and a values of 3 (yellow) or more (red) for areas with three or more overlapping flight lines, are expected. The average data overlaps for Mandulog, Iligan, and Agus are 50.73%, 40.16% and 97.87%, respectively.

Results and Discussion




Figure 27. Density map of merged LiDAR data for the Mandulog, Iligan, and Agus mission

The elevation difference between overlaps of adjacent flight lines is shown in Figure 28. The default color range is from blue to red, where bright blue areas correspond to a -0.20 meter difference, and bright red areas correspond to a +0.20 meter difference. Areas with bright red or bright blue need to be investigated further using QT Modeler.

Results and Discussion




Figure 28. Elevation difference map between flight lines

A screen capture of the LAS data loaded in QT Modeler for Mandulog-Iligan is shown in Figure 29b. A line graph showing the elevations of the points from all of the flight strips traversed by the profile in red line is shown in Figure 29a. It is evident that there are differences in elevation, but the differences do not exceed the 20-centimeter mark. No reprocessing was necessary for this LiDAR dataset.

Results and Discussion




Figure 29. Quality checking with the profile tool of QT Modeler for Mandulog-Iligan

A screen capture of the LAS data loaded in QT Modeler for Agus is shown in Figure 30b. A line graph showing the elevations of the points from all of the flight strips traversed by the profile in red line is shown in Figure 30a. It is evident that there are differences in elevation, but the differences do not exceed the 20-centimeter mark. No reprocessing was necessary for this LiDAR dataset.

Results and Discussion




Figure 30. Quality checking with the Profile Tool of QT Modeler for Agus

4.2.4 LiDAR Point Cloud Classification and Rasterization

The block system that TerraScan employed for the LiDAR data, shown in Figure 31a, Figure 32a, and Figure 33a, generated the following total number of 1 kilometer by 1 kilometer blocks: 114 for Mandulog, 104 for Iligan, and 218 for Agus. The results of final classification of the point cloud for Mandulog, Iligan, and Agus missions are shown in Figure 31b, Figure 32b, and Figure 33b, respectively. Table 11, Table 12, and Table 13 show the number of points classified to the pertinent categories along with other information for MIA 1, MIA 2, and Agus, respectively.

Results and Discussion




Figure 31. (a) Mandulog (MIA 1) floodplains and (b) Mandulog (MIA 1) classification results in TerraScan




Figure 32. (a) Ilog Hilabangan floodplains and (b) Ilog Hilabangan classification results in TerraScan

Results and Discussion




Figure 33. (a) Agus floodplains and (b) Agus classification results in Terrascan

Table 11. MIA 1 classification results in TerraScan

Pertinent Class	Count
Ground	0
Low Vegetation	440,578,881
Medium Vegetation	1,113,323,370
High Vegetation	401,182,187
Building	13,595,038
Number of 1km x 1km blocks	1,124
Maximum Height	588.15
Minimum Height	56.68

An isometric view of an area before (a) and after (b) running the classification routines for the mission is shown in Figure 29. The ground points are in brown, the vegetation is in different shades of green, and the buildings are in cyan. It can be seen that residential structures adjacent or even below canopy are classified correctly, due to the density of the LiDAR data.

Results and Discussion

Table 12. MIA 2 classification results in TerraScan

Pertinent Class	Count	Min elevation (m)	Max elevation (m)
Default	27,767,008	70.19	671.59
Ground	60,831,481	70.13	659.53
Low vegetation	95,425,973	70.19	659.71
Medium vegetation	79,430,113	70.23	659.81
High vegetation	53,536,167	72.87	676.45
Building	4,699,907	70.84	655.97

Table 13. Agus classification results in TerraScan

Pertinent Class	Count	Min elevation (m)	Max elevation (m)
Ground	991,104,184	70.19	671.59
Low Vegetation	128,317,405	70.13	659.53
Medium Vegetation	125,237,595	70.19	659.71
High Vegetation	92,951,468	70.23	659.81
Building	17,883,721	72.87	676.45
Number of 1km x 1km blocks	218	70.84	655.97
Maximum Height	677.54		
Minimum Height	53.27		

An isometric view of an area before (a) and after (b) running the classification routines for the mission is shown in Figure 34, Figure 35, and Figure 36. The ground points are in brown, the vegetation is in different shades of green, and the buildings are in cyan. It can be seen that residential structures adjacent or even below canopy are classified correctly, due to the density of the LiDAR data.




Figure 34. Point cloud (a) before and (b) after classification for Mandulog

Results and Discussion




Figure 35. Point cloud (a) before and (b) after classification for Iligan




Figure 36. Point cloud (a) before and (b) after classification for Agus

4.2.5 DEM Editing and Hydro-correction

Portions of DTMs for Iligan and Mandulog floodplains before and after manual editing are shown in Figure 37. Figure 37a shows an example of a small stream that suffers from discontinuity of flow due to an existing bridge. The bridge was removed in order to hydrologically correct the flow of water through the river as seen in Figure 37b. A small stream that suffers from discontinuity of flow that might have been caused by sparse point density in the area is shown in Figure 37c. The stream must be interpolated from the available stream elevation near it to correct the flow of water through it in Figure 37d.

Results and Discussion




Figure 37. Images of DTMs for Iligan and Mandulog before and after manual editing

Portions of DTMs for Agus before and after manual editing are shown Figure 38. It shows that the embankment might have been drastically cut by the classification routine in Figure 38a and clearly needed to be retrieved to complete the surface as in Figure 38b to allow a hydrologically correct flow of water. A small stream that suffers from discontinuity of flow due to an existing bridge in Figure 38c. The bridge is removed also to hydrologically correct the flow of water through the river in Figure 38d.

Results and Discussion




Figure 38. Images of DTMs for Agus flood plain before and after manual editing

The extent of the validation survey done by the Data Validation Component (DVC) in Iligan, Mandulog, and Agus to collect points with which the LiDAR dataset is validated is shown in Figure 39. A total of 1002, 278, and 2597 control points were collected for Iligan, Mandulog, and Agus, respectively. The good correlation between the airborne LiDAR elevation values and the ground survey elevation rates, which reflects the quality of the LiDAR DTM is shown in Figure 40. The computed RMSE between the LiDAR DTM and the surveyed elevation values are 10.1 centimeters, 4.6 centimeters, and 12.609 centimeters with a standard deviation of 10 centimeters, 4.6 centimeters, and 12.076 centimeters for Iligan, Mandulog, and Agus, respectively. The LE 90 value represents the linear vertical distance that 90% of the sampled DEM points and their respective DVC validation point counterparts should be found from each other. Other statistical information can be found in Table 14. The final DTM and extent of the bathymetric survey done along the river is shown in Figure 41.

Results and Discussion





Figure 39. Map of Mandulog, Iligan and Agus River Basin with validation survey shown in blue



Results and Discussion







Figure 40. One-one Correlation plot between topographic and LiDAR data for (a) Mandulog and (b) Iligan and (c) Agus

Results and Discussion

Table 14. Statistical values for the calibration of Iligan, Mandulog and Agus flights

Statistical Information	Iligan (cm)	Mandulog (cm)	Agus (cm)
Min	-47.1	-13.5	-60.529
Max	44.4	34.1	122.310
RMSE	10.1	4.6	12.609
Standard Deviation	10.0	4.6	12.076
LEgo	14.1	6.7	19.369



Results and Discussion




Figure 41. Final DTM of (a) Mandulog, (b) Iligan, and (c) Agus with validation survey shown in blue

The floodplain extent for Iligan, Mandulog and Agus is also presented, showing the completeness of the LiDAR dataset and DSM produced in Figure 42. Samples of 1 km by 1 km of DSM and DTM are shown in Figure 43 and Figure 44, respectively.




Figure 42. Final DSM in Agus, Mandulog and Iligan

Results and Discussion




Figure 43. Sample 1x1 square kilometer DSM




Figure 44. Sample 1x1 square kilometer DTM



Annexes

Annex A

ANNEX A. OPTECH TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION OF THE PEGASUS SENSOR

Parameter	Specification
Operational envelope (1,2,3,4)	150-5000 m AGL, nominal
Laser wavelength	1064 nm
Horizontal accuracy (2)	1/5,500 x altitude, (m AGL)
Elevation accuracy (2)	< 5-20 cm, 1σ
Effective laser repetition rate	Programmable, 33-167 kHz
Position and orientation system	POS AV TM AP50 (OEM)
Scan width (FOV)	Programmable, 0-75°
Scan frequency (5)	Programmable, 0-140 Hz (effective)
Sensor scan product	800 maximum
Beam divergence	0.25 mrad (1/e)
Roll compensation	Programmable, $\pm 37^\circ$ (FOV dependent)
Vertical target separation distance	<0.7 m
Range capture	Up to 4 range measurements, including 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and last returns
Intensity capture	Up to 4 intensity returns for each pulse, including last (12 bit)
Image capture	5 MP interline camera (standard); 60 MP full frame (optional)
Full waveform capture	12-bit Optech IWD-2 Intelligent Waveform Digitizer
Data storage	Removable solid state disk SSD (SATA II)
Power requirements	28 V, 800 W, 30 A
Dimensions and weight	Sensor: 630 x 540 x 450 mm; 65 kg;
	Control rack: 650 x 590 x 490 mm; 46 kg
Operating Temperature	-10°C to +35°C
Relative humidity	0-95% non-condensing



Annex B

ANNEX B. OPTECH TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION OF THE D-8900 AERIAL DIGITAL CAMERA

Parameter	Specification
Camera Head	
Sensor type	60 Mpix full frame CCD, RGB
Sensor format (H x V)	8, 984 x 6, 732 pixels
Pixel size	6µm x 6 µm
Frame rate	1 frame/2 sec.
FMC	Electro-mechanical, driven by piezo technology (patented)
Shutter	Electro-mechanical iris mechanism 1/125 to 1/500++ sec. f-stops: 5.6, 8, 11, 16
Lenses	50 mm/70 mm/120 mm/210 mm
Filter	Color and near-infrared removable filters
Dimensions (H x W x D)	200 x 150 x 120 mm (70 mm lens)
Weight	~4.5 kg (70 mm lens)
Controller Unit	
Computer	Mini-ITX RoHS-compliant small-form-factor embedded computers with AMD Turion™ 64 X2 CPU 4 GB RAM, 4 GB flash disk local storage IEEE 1394 Firewire interface
Removable storage unit	~500 GB solid state drives, 8,000 images
Power consumption	~8 A, 168 W
Dimensions	2U full rack; 88 x 448 x 493 mm
Weight	~15 kg
Image Pre-Processing Software	
Capture One	Radiometric control and format conversion, TIFF or JPEG
Image output	8,984 x 6,732 pixels or 16 bits per channel (180 MB or 360 MB per image)

Annex C

ANNEX C. THE SURVEY TEAM

Data Acquisition Component Sub-team	Designation/Affiliation	Name	Agency
Data Acquisition Component Leader	Data Component Project Leader –I	ENGR. CZAR JAKIRI S. SARMIENTO	UP-TCAGP
Survey Supervisor	Chief Science Research Specialist (CSRS)	ENGR. CHRISTOPHER CRUZ	UP TCAGP
LiDAR Operation	Supervising Science Research Specialist (Supervising SRS)	MARK GREGORY AÑO	UP TCAGP
LiDAR Operation	Research Associate	JASMINE ALVIAR	UP TCAGP
Data Download and Transfer	Research Associate	CHRISTOPHER JOAQUIN	UP TCAGP
Ground Survey	Research Associate	ENGR. GEROME HIPOLITO	UP TCAGP
LiDAR Operation	Airborne Security	SGG. LEE JAY PUNZALAN	Philippine Air Force (PAF)
LiDAR Operation	Pilot	CAPT. JAMAAL CLEMENTE	ASIAN AEROSPACE CORP (AAC)
LiDAR Operation	Co-pilot	CAPT. MARK TANGONAN	AAC



Annex D

ANNEX D. NAMRIA CERTIFICATION FOR LDN-01

 Republic of the Philippines
Department of Environment and Natural Resources
NATIONAL MAPPING AND RESOURCE INFORMATION AUTHORITY

April 18, 2013

CERTIFICATION

To whom it may concern:

This is to certify that according to the records on file in this office, the requested survey information is as follows -

Province: LANAO DEL NORTE		
Station Name: LDN-01		
Order: 3rd		
Island: MINDANAO	Barangay: POBLACION	
Municipality: ILIGAN CITY		
<i>PRS92 Coordinates</i>		
Latitude: 8° 14' 1.44528"	Longitude: 124° 13' 56.94179"	Ellipsoidal Hgt: 11.87000 m.
<i>WGS84 Coordinates</i>		
Latitude: 8° 13' 57.88944"	Longitude: 124° 14' 2.37264"	Ellipsoidal Hgt: 78.95000 m.
<i>PTM Coordinates</i>		
Northing: 910480.055 m.	Easting: 415436.191 m.	Zone: 5
<i>UTM Coordinates</i>		
Northing: 910,289.41	Easting: 635,751.93	Zone: 51

Location Description

LDN-01
From Iligan City, travel northeast going to Iligan City Pier for about 15 minutes drive. The station is located at the roof top of Iligan City PPA Administration building, inside the Iligan City Pier compound. Mark is a 30x30 cm cement putty monument, on top of PPA Administration building, with 4-inches on the center of the cement putty monument inscribed with station name LDN-01 2007 NCIP.

Requesting Party: **UP DREAM/ Melchor Nery**
Purpose: **Reference**
OR Number: **3943540 B**
T.N.: **2013-0307**

RUEL DM. BELEN, MNSA
Director, Mapping and Geodesy Department


9 9 0 4 1 8 2 0 1 3 1 0 1 1 5 4

 **NAMRIA OFFICES:**
Main : Lawton Avenue, Fort Bonifacio, 1634 Taguig City, Philippines Tel. No.: (632) 810-4831 to 41
Branch : 421 Barraco St. San Nicolas, 1010 Manila, Philippines, Tel. No. (632) 241-3494 to 98
www.namria.gov.ph

Annex E

ANNEX E. DATA TRANSFER SHEETS

Data Transfer Sheet for 1AGU1A117B and 1AGU1B118A

DATA TRANSFER SHEET														
May 7, 2013														
DATE	PLS NO.	MISSION NAME	SENSOR	RAW LAB	LOGS	POS	RAW MAGS	MISSION LOG FILE	BASED INSTRUM	BASE STATIONS	OPERATION COMMENTS (DMS LOGS)	PLANT PLAN	SERVER LOCATION	
Apr 25, 2013	1870	SPRINTS / Gamma Year Plus Plus 810 Supplementary Flight	GEOMA	NA	050B	070B	31.1 GB	253 KB	14.5 GB	NA	0.47MB	4777 BYTES	160B	2-Markham, B ms1970
Apr 26, 2013	1869	SC001A118A	PROGRAM	1000B	1000B	070B	30.9GB	242KB	15.1GB	NA	0.41MB	575 BYTES	58.40B	2-Markham, B ms1969
Apr 26, 2013	1868	11AGU1A118B	PROGRAM	1100B	070B	1100B	17.6GB	130KB	17.9GB	NA	0.41MB	800 BYTES	53.00B	2-Markham, B ms1968
Apr 27, 2013	1867	SC001B117A	PROGRAM	1000B	070B	1170B	27.1GB	201KB	15.8GB	NA	0.77MB	700 BYTES	7.82MB	2-Markham, B ms2007
Apr 27, 2013	1866	1AGU1A117B	PROGRAM	05.100B	1000B	0000B	25.3GB	177KB	16.7GB	NA	0.77MB	1.44MB	160B	2-Markham, B ms2017
Apr 26, 2013	1865	1AGU1B118A	PROGRAM	07.000B	0000B	1000B	14.5GB	120KB	9.91GB	NA	0.80MB			2-Markham, B ms2006

Received from	Received by
Name: <i>Andy Griffin / Graham</i>	Name: <i>John P. O'Brien</i>
Position: <i>CE-10-13, PA</i>	Position: <i>5-17-13</i>
Date: _____	Date: _____

Verified by
Name: <i>Stephanie Douglas / Douglas</i>
Position: <i>JPL</i>
Date: <i>5/14/13</i>
Page 1



Annex F

ANNEX F. FLIGHT LOGS

1. Flight Log for 1AGU117B Mission

EAM Data Acquisition Flight Log		Flight Log No.: 201	
1 UDAF Operator: J. Alvarez	2 ALTM Model: P2-45-43	3 Mission Name: 1MA117B	4 Aircraft Identification: 1A6U117B
7 Pilot: J. Cuente	8 Co-Pilot: M. Tangson	9 Route: CDO - Ilig, on CDO	5 Aircraft Type: Cessna T206H
10 Date: 27 April 2013	12 Airport of Departure (Airport, City/Province): CDO	12 Airport of Arrival (Airport, City/Province): CDO	4 Type: VER
13 Engine On: 1050 H	14 Engine Off: 1350 H	15 Total Engine Time: 3+00	16 Take off: 17 Landing:
18 Total Flight Time:	19 Weather: cloudy but with hot approaching build up / low cloud ceiling		
20 Remarks: Surveyed Iligan of Mandaya flood plains and upper portion of Agus. - changed file name during data transfer (from 1MA117B to 1A6U117B)			
21 Problems and Solutions: - Alarm in Inset B - intensity too low at Opt-Sim - restarted FMS Map			
Acquisition Flight Approved by  Signature over Printed Name (End User Representative)		Acquisition Flight Certified by  Signature over Printed Name (RAF Representative)	
Lidar Operator  Signature over Printed Name		 DREAM <small>Department of Research and Environmental Monitoring</small>	

Annex G

2. Flight Log for 1AGUS118A Mission

1015AM Data Acquisition Flight Log

Flight Log No.: 202

1 LIDAR Operator: <u>Mark AFB</u>	2 ALTM Model: <u>Perkins</u>	3 Mission Name: <u>LAGUS118A</u>	4 Type: <u>VFR</u>	5 Aircraft Type: <u>Cessna T208H</u>	6 Aircraft Identification: <u>RV-C-182Z</u>
7 Pilot: <u>J. Clemente</u>	8 Co-Pilot: <u>M. Tabor</u>	9 Route: <u>CDD</u>	12 Airport of Arrival (Airport, City/Province):		
10 Date: <u>28 Apr 2015</u>	11 Airport of Departure (Airport, City/Province): <u>CDD</u>	15 Total Engine Time: <u>08:24:15</u>	16 Take off: <u>08:45</u>	17 Landing: <u>11:10</u>	18 Total Flight Time: <u>2:25</u>
13 Engine On: <u>09:30</u>	14 Engine Off: <u>11:15</u>	19 Weather: <u>partly cloudy</u>			
20 Remarks: <u>Emergency</u>					

21 Problems and Solutions:

Acquisition Flight Approved by

Mark AFB

Signature over Printed Name
(End User Representative)

Acquisition Flight Controlled by

Sgt. Fred James Ramirez PAF

Signature over Printed Name
(PAF Representative)

Lidar Operator

Mark AFB

Signature over Printed Name



DREAM

Division for Data Acquisition and Assessment, USAF/AFM/AFM/AFM



Bibliography

- Paringit, E. (2014, June). River Basin and Flood Modeling and Flood Hazard Assessment of Rivers in the Cities of Cagayan de Oro and Iligan. Retrieved October 29, 2015, from http://projectclimatetwinphoenix.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Flood-modelling_Technical-Report_Lowres1.pdf
- Physical / Biological | Profile. (n.d.). Retrieved October 29, 2015, from <http://www.lanaodelnorte.gov.ph/Profile/physical-biological.html>





D R E A M
Disaster Risk and Exposure Assessment for Mitigation

