If reading the full-text version of this paper, please download article PDF to view Animation 4 in Adobe Acrobat or Adobe Reader. It is also available by visiting <http://doi.org/10.1130/GES01691.a4> or the full-text article on www.gsapubs.org.

Animation 4. Anaglyph stereo views of lithologic contacts at the Wildrose South site as drawn in three dimensions (3-D) on the terrestrial laser scanner (TLS)-derived terrain model (lavender lines) versus lithologic contacts drawn on an orthophoto and draped in 2.5-D onto a 30 m resolution digital elevation model (white lines). Note that this video is meant to be viewed with anaglyph glasses. The same colors are used for this scene in Figure 14. The most dramatic offsets between the interpretations exist where contact exposure was limited when making interpretations on both the orthophoto and the TLS model. Refer to Figure 14 for scale. This video was made using Move software. If reading the full-text version of this paper, please download article PDF to view Animation 4 in Adobe Acrobat or Adobe Reader. It is also available by visiting <http://doi.org/10.1130/GES01691.a4> or the full-text article on www.gsapubs.org.

to increase model accuracy. How these errors, combined with image collection errors, affect the resulting models of each method will be discussed in the following section.

The purpose of exploring method 1 was to show the results of an approach that requires the least amount of field and preparation time to perform. Method 1 is subject to location error of the recreational GNSS receiver

and the error from the laser rangefinder. The laser rangefinder error is related to a combination of instrument error, aiming issues, and (in)ability to accurately recognize the natural object later on in the imagery. It may be possible to minimize the potential for error caused by recognizing natural objects in the imagery by placing artificial markers in the field (essentially a combination of methods 1 and 3), but this approach would largely eliminate the advantages