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**Abstract**

*Problem Statement*
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*Methods*

*Results*

*Results Verification*

*Discussion and Conclusion*

**Problem Statement**

*Describe the specific problem and the context. Provide an illustrative figure and/or context map here. In the table, translate the qualitative problem statement elements into specific requirements for the analysis.*

*Table 1. Required Data*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Requirement** | **Defined As** | **(Spatial) Data** | **Attribute Data** | **Dataset** | **Preparation** |
| 1 | LiDAR (.las) | LiDAR for Study Extent | .las | Elevation | Minnesota DNR | ETL |
| 2 | Annual 30-Year Normals | Precipitation Normals (2021) | .bil | Precipitation | PRISM | ETL |
| 3 | NCLD Land Cover | Land Cover Classification | TIFF | Land Cover | Minnesota Geospatial Commons | ETL |
| 4 | Digital Elevation Model | Elevation (Wabasha, Winona, and Olmsted County) | TIFF | Elevation | Minnesota Geospatial Commons | ETL |

**Input Data**

*Describe the data in two paragraphs max. Fill out the table.*

*Table 2. Input Data*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Title** | **Purpose in Analysis** | **Link to Source** |
| 1 | LiDAR (.las) | To convert data to a TIN and DEM and visualize the output | [Minnesota DNR](https://resources.gisdata.mn.gov/pub/data/elevation/lidar/examples/lidar_sample/las/) |
| 2 | Annual 30-Year Normals | To create a space-time cube from a multidimensional raster layer and visualize it as an .gif animation | PRISM |
| 3 | NCLD Land Cover | To be used in the cost surface equation and find the most optimal route for Dory | Minnesota Geospatial Commons |
| 4 | Digital Elevation Model | To calculate the slope and add the output into the cost surface analysis to find the most optimal route for Dory | Minnesota Geospatial Commons |

**Methods**

**Part 1.1**

**Part 1.2**

**Part 1.3**

**Part 2**

*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.*

*If appropriate, add in pseudo-code describing model algorithms and/or objects. If using mathematical equations, create a clear mapping between the reference equation, pseudo-code, and actual implementation in a programming language.*

**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 |  |