Lab Report

Title: Lab 2 - Part 2

Notice: Dr. Bryan Runck

Author: Mattie Gisselbeck

Date: November 2, 2022

Repository: <https://github.com/mgisselbeck/GIS5571>

Time Spent: 20 hours

## Abstract

The objective of this analysis is to “create a surface that shows places where Dory would more or less prefer to walk in order to get to the park within Dory’s preferences.
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## Problem Statement

The objective of this analysis is to “create a surface that shows places where Dory would more or less prefer to walk in order to get to the park, within Dory’s preferences: (1) Dory prefers to not walk through any farm fields, (2) she doesn’t like crossing water bodies if there isn’t a bridge (though sometimes she doesn’t mind if she’s wearing her waders), and (3) prefers a path with the most gradual slope” (Runck, 2022).

*Table 1. Required Data*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Requirement** | **Defined As** | **(Spatial) Data** | **Attribute Data** | **Dataset** | **Preparation** |
| 1 | County Boundaries in Minnesota | Wabasha, Winona, and Olmstead County | .shp (Vector) | N/A | [Minnesota Geospatial Commons](https://gisdata.mn.gov/dataset/bdry-counties) | ETL |
| 2 | 2012 Assessed Streams | Assessed Streams for Minnesota in 2012 | .shp (Vector) | N/A | [Minnesota Geospatial Commons](https://gisdata.mn.gov/dataset/env-assessed-streams-2012) | ETL |
| 3 | NCLD 2019 Land Cover, Minnesota | Land Cover Classification for Minnesota | TIFF (Raster) | Land Cover Classification | [Minnesota Geospatial Commons](https://gisdata.mn.gov/dataset/biota-landcover-nlcd-mn-2019) | ETL |
| 4 | Minnesota Digital Elevation Model - 30 Meter Resolution | Elevation (Wabasha, Winona, and Olmsted County) | TIFF (Raster) | Elevation | [Minnesota Geospatial Commons](https://gisdata.mn.gov/dataset/elev-30m-digital-elevation-model) | ETL |
| 5 | Roads, Minnesota, 2012 | Road Centerlines for all Public Roads in Minnesota | .shp (Vector) | N/A | [Minnesota Geospatial Commons](https://gisdata.mn.gov/dataset/trans-roads-mndot-tis) | ETL |

## Input Data

The table below is a collection of data from the Minnesota Geospatial Commons. Data was scraped through an ETL in ArcGIS Pro via a Python notebook. All the data described below will be used in a cost path analysis to find an optimal route for Dory.

*Table 2. Input Data*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Title** | **Purpose in Analysis** | **Link to Source** |
| 1 | County Boundaries in Minnesota | To be used in the cost surface equation to find the most optimal route for Dory | [Minnesota Geospatial Commons](https://gisdata.mn.gov/dataset/bdry-counties) |
| 2 | 2012 Assessed Streams | To be used in the cost surface equation to find the most optimal route for Dory | [Minnesota Geospatial Commons](https://gisdata.mn.gov/dataset/env-assessed-streams-2012) |
| 3 | NCLD 2019 Land Cover, Minnesota | To be used in the cost surface equation to find the most optimal route for Dory | [Minnesota Geospatial Commons](https://gisdata.mn.gov/dataset/biota-landcover-nlcd-mn-2019) |
| 4 | Minnesota Digital Elevation Model - 30 Meter Resolution | To calculate the slope and add the output into the cost surface analysis to find the most optimal route for Dory | [Minnesota Geospatial Commons](https://gisdata.mn.gov/dataset/elev-30m-digital-elevation-model) |
| 5 | Roads, Minnesota, 2012 | To be used in the cost surface equation to find the most optimal route for Dory | [Minnesota Geospatial Commons](https://gisdata.mn.gov/dataset/trans-roads-mndot-tis) |

## Methods

Dory’s Farm: 44.127985, -92.148796

Picnic Area in Whitewater State Park: 44.054852, -92.045780

Based on Dory’s preferences, the objective is to find a path that avoids farm fields, water bodies without a bridge, and has a gradual slope. The starting point, Dory’s Farm, is 44.127985, -92.148796 and end point, picnic area in Whitewater State Park, is 44.054852, -92.045780.
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*Figure 1. Data Flow Diagram.*

## Results

The results are shown in the figures below (see Fig. 3 through Figure 8). The main themes of the lab were preparing data in an ETL pipeline, creating a cost surface to find an optimal route. The data flow diagram above (Fig. 1) shows all the variables and commands I applied in finding an optimal route for Dory.

## 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?*
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