Finca Nolla Paseo Post, Camuy January 10, 2023.


Centroid coordinates: $18.48911^{\circ} \mathrm{N} 66.84395^{\circ} \mathrm{W}$

## 3D map

Finca Nolla Paseo Post, Camuy


## 2D map



Total area of site $=2.27638$ ha

Beach length (m)
Finca Nolla Paseo Post, Camuy


Beach length $=205.073 \mathrm{~m}$

## Density surface model <br> Finca Nolla Paseo Post, Camuy



## Area of the beach

Finca Nolla Paseo Post, Camuy


Area of the beach $=5,429.91 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$

## Beach volume

Finca Nolla Paseo Post, Camuy


Cut $=0.00 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$
Fill $=-215,297 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$
Volume Dif. = -215,297 m³

## Beach elevation <br> Finca Nolla Paseo Post, Camuy






Site elevation (m)
Finca Nolla Paseo Post, Camuy


Dune height ( m )
Finca Nolla Paseo Post, Camuy


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dune height } \\
& \mathbf{A}=0.134 \mathrm{~m} \\
& \mathbf{B}=2.353 \mathrm{~m} \\
& \mathbf{C}=0.249 \mathrm{~m}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Dune width (m)

Finca Nolla Paseo Post, Camuy


Dune width
$A=50.045 \mathrm{~m}$
$B=10.724 \mathrm{~m}$
$\mathrm{C}=43.28 \mathrm{~m}$

## Area and perimeter of dune

Finca Nolla Paseo Post, Camuy


Area and perimeter of dune
2D area $=5,449.92 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$
3D area $=5,449.92 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$
2D perimeter $=468.842 \mathrm{~m}$
3D perimeter $=468.842 \mathrm{~m}$
Elevation difference $=0.00 \mathrm{~m}$

Volume of dune
Finca Nolla Paseo Post, Camuy


| Base surface | Triangulated |
| :--- | ---: |
|  |  |
| Cut volume | $0.00 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ |
| Cut error | $0.00 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ |
| Fill volume | $-200,125 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ |
| Fill error | $341.412 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ |
| Volume difference | $-200,125 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ |

## Shoreline

Finca Nolla Paseo Post, Camuy


Shoreline length $=213.384 \mathrm{~m}$

## Shoreline geolocation

Finca Nolla Paseo Post, Camuy


> Shoreline markers
> $\mathbf{A}=18.48944^{\circ} \mathrm{N} 66.84470^{\circ} \mathrm{W}$
> $\mathbf{B}=18.48941^{\circ} \mathrm{N} 66.84432^{\circ} \mathrm{W}$
> $\mathbf{C}=18.48926^{\circ} \mathrm{N} 66.84391^{\circ} \mathrm{W}$
> $\mathbf{D}=18.48923^{\circ} \mathrm{N} 66.84352^{\circ} \mathrm{W}$
> $\mathrm{E}=18.48909^{\circ} \mathrm{N} 66.84316^{\circ} \mathrm{W}$

## Shoreline extension

Finca Nolla Paseo Post, Camuy


Shoreline extension
$\mathbf{A}=38.814 \mathrm{~m}$
B $=37.573 \mathrm{~m}$
C $=40.458 \mathrm{~m}$

## Shoreline position

Finca Nolla Paseo Post, Camuy


Shoreline position
$\mathbf{A}=31.72 \mathrm{~m}$
$B=49.602 \mathrm{~m}$
C $=30.636 \mathrm{~m}$

## Area of dune breaches

Finca Nolla Paseo Post, Camuy


Area of dune breaches
Breach $=5,449.92 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$
(I) Important: Click on the different icons for:
(?)
Help to analyze the results in the Quality ReportAdditional information about the sections

Click here for additional tips to analyze the Quality Report

## Summary

| Project | 198002-Project-2023-01-10T23:53:29.526Z |
| :--- | :--- |
| Processed | $2023-01-1101: 07: 04$ |
| Camera Model Name(s) | FC6310R_8.8_5472x3648 (RGB) |
| Average Ground Sampling Distance (GSD) | $1.05 \mathrm{~cm} / 0.41 \mathrm{in}$ |
| Area Covered | $0.023 \mathrm{~km}^{2} / 2.2674 \mathrm{ha} / 0.01 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{mi} . / 5.6058$ acres |
| Time for Initial Processing (without report) | $57 \mathrm{~m}: 07 \mathrm{~s}$ |


| Quality Check (i) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (?) Images | median of 58798 keypoints per image | $\bigcirc$ |
| (3) Dataset | 246 out of 263 images calibrated (93\%), all images enabled, 3 blocks | $\triangle$ |
| (?) Camera Optimization | 0.09\% relative difference between initial and optimized internal camera parameters | ( |
| (?) Matching | median of 9472.82 matches per calibrated image | ( |
| (? Georeferencing | yes, no 3D GCP | $\triangle$ |



Figure 1: Orthomosaic and the corresponding sparse Digital Surface Model (DSM) before densification.

## Calibration Details

| Number of Calibrated Images | 246 out of 263 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Number of Geolocated Images | 263 out of 263 |



Figure 2: Top view of the initial image position. The green line follows the position of the images in time starting from the large blue dot.
? Computed Image/GCPs/Manual Tie Points Positions


Figure 3: Offset between initial (blue dots) and computed (green dots) image positions as well as the offset between the GCPs initial positions (blue crosses) and their computed positions (green crosses) in the top-view (XY plane), front-view (XZ plane), and side-view (YZ plane). Red dots indicate disabled or uncalibrated images. Dark green ellipses indicate the absolute position uncertainty of the bundle block adjustment result.

|  | $\mathrm{X}[\mathrm{m}]$ | $\mathrm{Y}[\mathrm{m}]$ | $\mathrm{Z}[\mathrm{m}]$ | Omega [degree] | Phi [degree] | Kappa [degree] |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mean | 0.051 | 0.048 | 0.078 | 0.062 | 0.057 | 0.088 |
| Sigma | 0.555 | 0.368 | 0.821 | 0.354 | 0.435 | 0.753 |

Overlap


Figure 4: Number of overlapping images computed for each pixel of the orthomosaic.
Red and yellow areas indicate low overlap for which poor results may be generated. Green areas indicate an overlap of over 5 images for every pixel. Good quality results will be generated as long as the number of keypoint matches is also sufficient for these areas (see Figure 5 for keypoint matches)

Bundle Block Adjustment Details (i)

| Number of 2D Keypoint Observations for Bundle Block Adjustment | 2913315 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Number of 3D Points for Bundle Block Adjustment | 1193337 |
| Mean Reprojection Error [pixels] | 0.177 |

## (?) Internal Camera Parameters

FC6310R_8.8_5472x3648 (RGB). Sensor Dimensions: 12.833 [mm] x 8.556 [mm]
(i)

EXIF ID: FC6310R $8.8 \mathbf{5 4 7 2 \times 3 6 4 8}$

|  | Focal Length | Principal <br> Point x | Principal Point y | R1 | R2 | R3 | T1 | T2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial Values | $\begin{aligned} & 3658.300[\text { pixel }] \\ & 8.580[\mathrm{~mm}] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2722.500[\text { pixel }] \\ & 6.385[\mathrm{~mm}] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1835.100[\text { pixel }] \\ & 4.304[\mathrm{~mm}] \end{aligned}$ | -0.269 | 0.112 | -0.033 | 0.000 | -0.001 |
| Optimized Values | $\begin{aligned} & 3654.894 \text { [pixel] } \\ & 8.572[\mathrm{~mm}] \end{aligned}$ | 2733.736 [pixel] <br> 6.411 [mm] | 1817.611 [pixel] <br> 4.263 [mm] | 0.002 | -0.021 | 0.021 | -0.001 | -0.001 |
| Uncertainties (Sigma) | $\begin{aligned} & 0.386 \text { [pixel] } \\ & 0.001 \text { [mm] } \end{aligned}$ | 0.266 [pixel] <br> 0.001 [mm] | 0.443 [pixel] <br> 0.001 [mm] | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.000 |



2D Keypoints Table

|  | Number of 2D Keypoints per Image | Number of Matched 2D Keypoints per Image |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Median | 58798 | 9473 |
| Min | 26714 | 46 |
| Max | 79013 | 35334 |
| Mean | 56258 | 11843 |

(?) 3D Points from 2D Keypoint Matches

|  | Number of 3D Points Observed |
| :--- | :--- |
| In 2 Images | 911249 |
| In 3 Images | 168772 |
| In 4 Images | 57929 |
| In 5 Images | 25767 |
| In 6 Images | 12671 |
| In 7 Images | 6726 |
| In 8 Images | 3821 |
| In 9 Images | 2257 |
| In 10 Images | 1356 |
| In 11 Images | 860 |
| In 12 Images | 608 |
| In 13 Images | 412 |
| In 14 Images | 335 |
| In 15 Images | 176 |
| In 16 Images | 145 |
| In 17 Images | 98 |
| In 18 Images | 67 |
| In 19 Images | 44 |
| In 20 Images | 19 |
| In 21 Images | 13 |
| In 22 Images | 7 |
| In 23 Images | 1 |
| Im |  |


| In 24 Images | 1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| In 25 Images | 1 |
| In 26 Images | 2 |

(?) 2D Keypoint Matches


Figure 5: Computed image positions with links between matched images. The darkness of the links indicates the number of matched 2D keypoints between the images. Bright links indicate weak links and require manual tie points or more images. Dark green ellipses indicate the relative camera position uncertainty of the bundle block adjustment result.

## Relative camera position and orientation uncertainties

|  | $\mathrm{X}[\mathrm{m}]$ | $\mathrm{Y}[\mathrm{m}]$ | $\mathrm{Z}[\mathrm{m}]$ | Omega [degree] | Phi [degree] | Kappa [degree] |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mean | 0.026 | 0.029 | 0.022 | 0.056 | 0.049 | 0.056 |
| Sigma | 0.042 | 0.031 | 0.030 | 0.086 | 0.126 | 0.307 |

## Geolocation Details

| - | -0.84 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| -0.84 | -0.67 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| -0.67 | -0.51 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| -0.51 | -0.34 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| -0.34 | -0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| -0.17 | 0.00 | 47.92 | 54.69 | 44.79 |
| 0.00 | 0.17 | 52.08 | 45.31 | 55.21 |
| 0.17 | 0.34 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.34 | 0.51 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.51 | 0.67 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.67 | 0.84 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.84 | - | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Mean [m] |  | 0.000496 | 0.001004 |  |
| Sigma [m] |  | 0.009859 | 0.012255 | -0.000974 |
| RMS Error [m] |  | 0.009871 | 0.012296 | 0.023597 |
|  |  |  | 0.023617 |  |

Min Error and Max Error represent geolocation error intervals between -1.5 and $\mathbf{1 . 5}$ times the maximum accuracy of all the images. Columns $X, Y, Z$ show the percentage of images with geolocation errors within the predefined error intervals. The geolocation error is the difference between the initial and computed image positions. Note that the image geolocation errors do not correspond to the accuracy of the observed 3D points.

## (?) Relative Geolocation Variance

| Relative Geolocation Error | Images X [\%] | Images Y [\%] | Images Z [\%] |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $[-1.00,1.00]$ | 90.63 | 91.67 | 86.98 |
| $[-2.00,2.00]$ | 96.35 | 96.88 | 97.40 |
| $[-3.00,3.00]$ | 99.48 | 97.92 | 98.96 |
| Mean of Geolocation Accuracy $[\mathbf{m}]$ | 0.015237 | 0.015237 | 0.034335 |
| Sigma of Geolocation Accuracy $[\mathbf{m}]$ | 0.020347 | 0.020347 | 0.040730 |

Images $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}$ represent the percentage of images with a relative geolocation error in $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}$.

| Geolocation Orientational Variance | RMS [degree] |
| :--- | :--- |
| Omega | 0.629 |
| Phi | 0.547 |
| Kappa | 2.472 |

Geolocation RMS error of the orientation angles given by the difference between the initial and computed image orientation angles.

## Initial Processing Details

## System Information

| Hardware | CPU: Intel(R) Xeon(R) Platinum 8124M CPU @ 3.00 GHz |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | RAM: 69GB |
| GPU: no info (Driver: unknown) |  |
| Operating System | Linux 5.15.0-1026-aws x86_64 |

Coordinate Systems

| Image Coordinate System | WGS 84 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Output Coordinate System | WGS 84/ UTM zone 19N |


| Keypoints Image Scale | Full, Image Scale: 1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Advanced: Matching Image Pairs | Aerial Grid or Corridor |
| Advanced: Matching Strategy | Use Geometrically Verified Matching: no |
| Advanced: Keypoint Extraction | Targeted Number of Keypoints: Automatic |
| Advanced: Calibration | Calibration Method: Standard <br> Internal Parameters Optimization: All <br> External Parameters Optimization: All <br> Rematch: Auto, yes |

## Point Cloud Densification details

## Processing Options

| Image Scale | multiscale, $1 / 2$ (Half image size, Default) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Point Density | Optimal |
| Minimum Number of Matches | 3 |
| 3D Textured Mesh Generation | yes |
| 3D Textured Mesh Settings: | Resolution: Medium Resolution (default) <br> Color Balancing: no |
| LOD | Generated: no |
| Advanced: 3D Textured Mesh Settings | Sample Density Divider: 1 |
| Advanced: Image Groups | group1 |
| Advanced: Use Processing Area | yes |
| Advanced: Use Annotations | yes |
| Time for Point Cloud Densification | $09 \mathrm{~m}: 24 \mathrm{~s}$ |
| Time for Point Cloud Classification | NA |
| Time for 3D Textured Mesh Generation | $08 m: 32 \mathrm{~s}$ |

## Results

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Number of Generated Tiles } & 1\end{array}$
Number of 3D Densified Points 22095171

| Average Density $\left(\right.$ per $\mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) | 3799.01 |
| :--- | :--- |

## DSM, Orthomosaic and Index Details

| DSM and Orthomosaic Resolution | $1 \times$ GSD (1.05 [cm/pixel]) |
| :--- | :--- |
| DSM Filters | Noise Filtering: yes <br> Surface Smoothing: yes, Type: Sharp |
| Raster DSM | Generated: yes <br> Method: Inverse Distance Weighting <br> Merge Tiles: yes |
| Generated: yes <br> Merge Tiles: yes |  |
|  | GeoTIFF Without Transparency: no <br> Google Maps Tiles and KML: no |
| Time for Orthomosaic Generation | $05 \mathrm{~m}: 09 \mathrm{~s}$ |
| Time for DTM Generation | $11 \mathrm{~m}: 33 \mathrm{~s}$ |
| Time for Contour Lines Generation | 00 s |
| Time for Reflectance Map Generation | 00 s |
| Time for Index Map Generation | 00 s |
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