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**Abstract**

*<Delete this text in light grey throughout>*

*250 words max. Clearly summarize the following major sections. Each gets one or two sentences.*

## Problem Statement

The purpose of this project is to LiDAR data and a Viewshed analysis to detect shadows when the sun as at 5% above the horizon for the state of Minnesota.

*Table 1.The required data will be LAS data from the state of Minnesota.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Requirement** | **Defined As** | **Spatial Data** | **Attribute Data** | **Dataset** | **Preparation** |
| 1 | Minnesota State LiDAR | Raw input dataset from MNDNR | LAS | N/A | MNDNR | Unzip LAZ file if Applicable. Possibly remove noise and pits. |
| 2 | High volume traffic | > 100 cars per hour |  | Volume | AADT Data |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Input Data

All the outputs will be derived from the LAS dataset. After the LAS data is cleaned, a DEM (and possibly DSM, nDSM) will be derived to the ground points. From there a Viewshed model will create the final output.

*Table 2. <insert caption>*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Title** | **Purpose in Analysis** | **Link to Source** |
| 1 | Minnesota Roads | Raw input dataset for routing analysis from MNDOT | [Mn GeoSpatial Commons](https://gisdata.mn.gov/dataset/trans-roads-mndot-tis) |
| 2 |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## Methods

*Include a data flow diagram or screenshot from model builder. Do references in line (Rammankutty, 2033). Document any and all steps that you did to the input data in the data flow diagram. Provide natural language description of the most important steps, giving a narrative arc and provide well formatting screenshots with a boarder and centered throughout.*

*Resources on Data Flow Diagrams:*

* [*https://www.visual-paradigm.com/tutorials/data-flow-diagram-dfd.jsp*](https://www.visual-paradigm.com/tutorials/data-flow-diagram-dfd.jsp)
* [*https://www.lucidchart.com/pages/data-flow-diagram/how-to-make-a-dfd*](https://www.lucidchart.com/pages/data-flow-diagram/how-to-make-a-dfd)

*Figure 1. Data flow diagram.*

## Results

*Show the results in figures and maps. Describe how they address the problem statement.*

*Follow best practice for map design, coloring, etc.*

### Results Verification

*How do you know your results are correct? This can be a qualitative or quantitative verification.*

## Discussion and Conclusion

*What did you learn? How does it relate to the main problem?*

### References

*Use a common format*

**Self-score**

*Fill out this rubric for yourself and include it in your lab report. The same rubric will be used to generate a grade in proportion to the points assigned in the syllabus to the assignment.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Description** | **Points Possible** | **Score** |
| **Structural Elements** | All elements of a lab report are included **(2 points each)**:  Title, Notice: Dr. Bryan Runck, Author, Project Repository, Date, Abstract, Problem Statement, Input Data w/ tables, Methods w/ Data, Flow Diagrams, Results, Results Verification, Discussion and Conclusion, References in common format, Self-score | 28 |  |
| **Clarity of Content** | Each element above is executed at a professional level so that someone can understand the goal, data, methods, results, and their validity and implications in a 5 minute reading at a cursory-level, and in a 30 minute meeting at a deep level **(12 points)**. There is a clear connection from data to results to discussion and conclusion **(12 points)**. | 24 |  |
| **Reproducibility** | Results are completely reproducible by someone with basic GIS training. There is no ambiguity in data flow or rationale for data operations. Every step is documented and justified. | 28 |  |
| **Verification** | Results are correct in that they have been verified in comparison to some standard. The standard is clearly stated **(10 points)**, the method of comparison is clearly stated **(5 points)**, and the result of verification is clearly stated **(5 points)**. | 20 |  |
|  |  | 100 |  |