F1 Journal

Don’t know what to do about the BM calculations because 1 BM is 2.158 m off and another BM is 0.991 m off. Going to subtract by the average of -1.57.

Added Algae and 0001 is most likely messed up and need to redo BM’s for that year. Yep, that is the year they shot a rock instead of the other BM. Gotta figure this one out.

They shot the rock top of a rock 21 m away and it appears to be the largest rock in the stream channel.

Found the rock top in the 9394 survey. Going to replace the coordinates with that one!

Fixed it and got all the points looking good except for the flume… The flume points for 0001 are on the East side of the BM’s and upstream instead of downstream and West. All the other algae however is good…

Something is wrong with hillshading. Gotta figure that out too….

22 march 15

Fixed HS somehow but don’t know how. Going to try to work up the algae data and plot in Matlab.

0001 points are totally off. I don’t know exactly what to do. But water edge goes from river up the bank, and the flume is off in a totally different direction. They describe the rock rim and top perfect though. I am confused. I am NOT going to use data from 0001 because it is just too flawed.

0203 has algae in the polygons and not in the stream. What is going on with F1??? It looks like the wetted perimeter might have algae on it and that is why they measured it, but that is up the hill a bit and not in the actual stream.

26 march 15

In Santa Fe, going to try to run Matlab without using 0001 data. See how that turns out.

E2P using 1011 lidar since 0910 is bad. It seems nobody knew how to use the lidar machine pre-2010.

Problem: I have lidar data from 2010/11 and am missing algae data from 1011. This means that I can’t reference the algae from 1011 to the lidar 1011 and difference everything from there. I emailed Chris and Rob in a last ditch effort to get this to work.

Everything plotted well, but 9394 and 0001 are incredibly off. Otherwise the mats are about 10cm different.

30 march 15

I have found a major problem with 9394 canada data. It appears that a series of measurements were taken without marking that the prism rod height was changed throughout the period. At first glance the mistakes seem random, but there is a very clear distinction between one set of data which hovers at a lidar difference of 0.08, and the next step up which is around 1.14 average difference. It was random at first within Arc. But when looking through the excel data from the past, all the mistakes are in order which would assume that the rod was changed or dropped on accident as they sometimes do if the clip is not fastened tightly. So I am going to subtract 1 m from all of those measurements. Will note somehow in the thesis write up.

For 0203, I can delete the backsight as those are never correct as the lidar can’t shoot a rebar stake. Deleting stream on glacial side elevation 52.9121 as it may have been a rock or a bad shoot. Is 4 m+off. Not possible.

31 March 15

9394 has a couple of outliers. One rock that must not have been shot properly with the lidar, because the other rock points match up, but it must have interpolated between the rock top and sandy bottom giving it a large (0.5m) error. Deleted rock point at 1383987.171 Northing. Same deal with another rock at 1383997.152 Northing. Deleted. Finally a negative point at 1383988.617 moss edge that is 20 cm below average. Got contour points plotted in Matlab and deleted 1 point in 0203 that is far off stream on glacial side. 1384000.434 Northing now it is 1383998.078…

14 apr 15

Finished up adding AFDM data and deleting old stuff and things.