





#### Abstract

Geologic mapping, field-data collection, and map construction at the West Virginia Geological and Economic Survey is continuously undergoing tremendous changes. Starting with paper notebooks and PDAs for collecting vector data, mapping at the Survey has transitioned to cell phones and tablets as the primary method to collect and evaluate data in the field. Over the same period, advances in consumer technology, revolutions in digital data (LIDAR), changes in map requirements and the inclusion of new criteria to accommodate seamless mapping in support of the U.S. Geoframework Initiative have all changed the way data are integrated into a map. These changes have been the driving force behind the iterative advances in our workflow. The most substantial changes have been in the automated collection of data through commercial software such as ESRI Field Maps(™), digital basemaps in the field, and the digitization of supplemental note-taking through the use of tablets. Field Maps allows for the real-time collection and evaluation of data and reduces in-office paperwork. Digital note-taking through tablets with stylii and note-taking apps create a permanent digital repository of notes and annotated photos stored as .pdfs. This presentation will discuss the evolution of WVGES collecting practices and comment on what the future holds for the agency. It will focus on the tools we have selected, their advantages and our continuing search for the next generation of tools. It will also touch on the "growing pains" associated with using new technology - both hardware and software - out in the field and the changes we have had to make in office to accommodate each new iteration. This process is summarized by a perpetual technology innovation cycle of idea - testing - deployment driven by need and technological change. This loop is perhaps more familiar to the software eveloper than the traditional geologist - another sign of the growing interrelationships between geology and other fields of science and engineering.

## A brief look of how the collection of field data has evolved at WVGES

#### Fieldwork back in "the olden days"

- Paper notebooks
- Paper maps and colored pencils
- Brunton compass
- Location pinpointed from map
- Hand drawn geological draft maps
- Hand drawn outcrops
- Print photos and slides stored in filing cabinets
- Topo maps based off older aerial photos



listoric field notes and maps remain valid However, challenges exist in associating them with modern projects including:

- Sites inexactly located compared to GPS precision
- Notes may refer to landmarks that no longer exist

If historic notes can be georeferenced, the site may not be revisitable due to: Urbanization

- Erosion / overgrowth • Landscape beautification

Oftentimes, these historical data remain the only record of bedrock exposure.

#### Fieldwork several years ago

- GPS coordinates UTM coordinates
- Waterproof field notebooks
- Using ArcGIS to draw lines
- Digital photos stored on a computer
- Photo size 5-10 MB
- Field locations digitally added to ArcGIS in the office, usually without field notes
- Introduction of PDAs / Tablets
- Topo maps revised extensively since 2000

#### **Fieldwork today**

- Location collected by tablet and added to online database / Field Maps app
- Geolocated field notes
- Digital supplemental notes saved as .pdfs (*Inkredible app*)
- Digital photos integrated into database or supplementary notes
- Photos directly annotated
- Photos >10MB
- LIDAR-based mapping
- Pre-fieldwork office time necessary to set up software each year
- Stylli based tablets



![](_page_0_Picture_43.jpeg)

eft: A portion of the ewisburg Quadrangle, 2022, howing numerous sinkholes bvious through LIDAR but nderrepresented on opographical maps

**Right:** A portion of the Bruceton Mills Quadrangle, 2023, showing long andstone cliffs. These cliffs occur on remote, private ands with difficult access.

# **Changes In Field Mapping In The Last Five Years From The Perspective Of The Mapper Advantages of the stylus-based tablet**

## John Tudek, J. Wayne Perkins, Derek L. Spurgeon West Virginia Geological and Economic Survey

DEPLOY

**IDEA:** A new method is suggested due to internal or external influences (ex. GeMS – Geologic Map Schema).

**PROPOSAL:** One or more ways to implement the new method are suggested. **TEST:** The method is tested on a small scale. The method could be a success, require revision or be discarded in favor of a new method. **DEPLOY:** Once successful, the new method is exposed to the entire mapping team. This, in turn, frequently suggests another idea.

#### Current field mapping device – Samsung Galaxy A with S-Pen

![](_page_0_Picture_52.jpeg)

#### How is working with a tablet different than a field notebook or PDA? Benefits Challenges

- Software (ESRI) bugs and improvements Can see the map evolve in real time overlain on LIDAR can break functionality
- Handwriting easier than typing on a Tablet OS upgrades can break functionality • Employees need to be trained and updated screen on software
- Voice to text (when not next to highway)
- Can annotate photos directly
- Integrate nearby mappers' data

This project was partially funded through the award of STATEMAP project G22AC00605-00. STATEMAP is part of the National Cooperative Geologic Mapping Program of the United States Geological Survey.

#### A portion of the draft map of The Franklin Quad around 2010. This is a scan of a physical map with hand-drawn lines. These lines would eventually be digitized and entered into a GIS program for publication as a paper map.

School

![](_page_0_Picture_64.jpeg)

![](_page_0_Picture_65.jpeg)

#### **Fieldwork Advances are Iterative**

![](_page_0_Picture_69.jpeg)

#### **Specifications**

- Model Number: SM-P200
- Screen Size: 8.0"
- Internal Memory: 32 GB
- External SD card slot: available (max 512 GB)
- Android version 11
- Software:
- Field Maps
- Inkredible Pro
- GPS Status
- Adobe Reader

• Network unavailability in remote areas • Dependent on battery life

Mappers at the Survey have the option of using a stylus-based tablet (Samsung Galaxy Tab A) for mapping. When used in conjunction with a note taking app like Inkredible Pro, the tablet holds certain advantages over a paper-and-pen field notebook as well as simply entering data into a tablet form.

![](_page_0_Picture_83.jpeg)

Annotating photos with geologic data is faster and more accurate than sketching.

![](_page_0_Picture_85.jpeg)

Annotating photos of fossils found in the field is more meaningful and does not require drawing skills.

×	Му	، Sur	/ey		No.	Ξ
Geologic Age	0	-0-	0	-0-	-0-	-0
Perm Perm Penn _Pen n	Miss	Devo n	Silur	Ordo v	Cam b	Preca m
Group						
Formation						
S D Comments						~
Strike Direction						
						~
Strike Angle						
Dip Direction						
						~
UID Angle						~

×	Collect	~
•	<b>Field Points</b> 39.658249°N 79.849286°W	
Stra	tigraphy	^
Ge N	eologic Age o value	
Gr	oup o value	
N	ap Unit o value	
Bed	ding Data	~
Stru	cture Data	~
Sam	nple Data	~
Pale	eontology Data	~
Obs		

### Improving and iterating on the Forms for use in ESRI Field Maps

With the GeMS requirement in our mapping deliverables, it was necessary to redesign our data collection practices. Over the course of several months, we redesigned both the interface and back-end, incorporating lessons from previous iterations. Among the changes are:

- typed, handwritten, or spoken.
- more description.
- fields.
- Added nested layers. • Sections categorized by keys for improved
- manipulation.

Left: The main screen of the new form, as seen on a cellphone. The cellphone is preferred as the collection device because it is more portable, utilizes cell signal to upload data in the field and takes better photos.

> Right: the expande bedding data menu showing all the subentries.

![](_page_0_Picture_98.jpeg)

![](_page_0_Picture_99.jpeg)

![](_page_0_Picture_100.jpeg)

Customizing each page's background allows the user to tailor each page to the data

![](_page_0_Picture_102.jpeg)

Whole field seasons are saved as a .pdf and kept with other data from that project.

• Expanded ways to input data. Text can now be • Text fields were made longer to incorporate

• Redesigned layout to prioritize most important

×	Collect	~
•	Field Points 39.658249°N 79.849286°W	
Bed	ding Data	^
N N	edding data to be taken?	$\otimes$
	dding Description	
	rike Azimuth	
	p Direction	
	o value	
Stru	icture Data	~
San	nple Data	~

#### **Current Record Layout**

The top portion contains the basic information about the geologic unit at the data poin as well as the user and timestamp.

The center portion contains descriptive data, divided into sections (blue box). Each section contains a key (circled) marking that it contains data. If necessary, additional subdivisions can be appended to the record.

The bottom portion contains several fields not visible in the user interface for Field Maps (yellow box). These fields show geographic accuracy and hardware information.

Autibules Geometry	
OBJECTID	552
Geologic Age	Pennsylvanian
Group	Allegheny
Map Unit	Undifferentiated
Hiearchy Key	30.1800.10000
Label	Pa
GlobalID	{39E99DC6-389D-4704-8DE6-62C2DA403C3
Field	<null></null>
CreationDate	2/7/2023 3:12:11 PM
Creator	jtudek_WVGES
EditDate	2/7/2023 3:12:11 PM
Editor	jtudek_WVGES
Station ID	itudek2023-02-07T10:12:08-05:00
Bedding data to be taken?	Yes
Bedding Description	horizontal dk grev shale, similar to across th
Dip Direction	NW
Dip Angle	7
Strike Azimuth	16
Structure data to be taken?	No
Structure Type	<null></null>
Structure Description	<nulls< td=""></nulls<>
Inclination	<nulls< td=""></nulls<>
Azimuth	<nulls< td=""></nulls<>
Sample data to be taken?	No
Sample ID#	Nulls
Sample Tune	<nulls< td=""></nulls<>
Sample Description	<nulls< td=""></nulls<>
Delever less Detecte les teles 2	
Paleontology Data to be taken:	yes
Observations /Nates	ANULS
Geographic Confidence	<null></null>
Stratigraphic Confidence	<nulls< td=""></nulls<>
stratigraphic confidence	Sinuitz
Position source time	2
Position source type	2 Samanum SM N05011
Position source type Receiver Name	2 Samsung SM-N950U
Position source type Receiver Name Latitude	2 Samsung SM-N950U 39.690871
Position source type Receiver Name Latitude Longitude	2 Samsung SM-N950U 39.690871 -79.627908
Position source type Receiver Name Latitude Longitude Altitude	2 Samsung SM-N950U 39.690871 -79.627908 436.8
Position source type Receiver Name Latitude Longitude Altitude Horizontal Accuracy (m)	2 Samsung SM-N950U 39.690871 -79.627908 436.8 4.7
Position source type Receiver Name Latitude Longitude Altitude Horizontal Accuracy (m) Vertical Accuracy (m)	2 Samsung SM-N950U 39.690871 -79.627908 436.8 4.7 3.76
Position source type Receiver Name Latitude Longitude Altitude Horizontal Accuracy (m) Vertical Accuracy (m) Fix Time	2 Samsung SM-N950U 39.690871 -79.627908 436.8 4.7 3.76 2/7/2023 3:10:17 PM
Position source type Receiver Name Latitude Longitude Altitude Horizontal Accuracy (m) Vertical Accuracy (m) Fix Time Fix Type	2 Samsung SM-N950U 39.690871 -79.627908 436.8 4.7 3.76 2/7/2023 3:10:17 PM 1
Position source type Receiver Name Latitude Longitude Altitude Horizontal Accuracy (m) Vertical Accuracy (m) Fix Time Fix Type Correction Age	2 Samsung SM-N950U 39.690871 -79.627908 436.8 4.7 3.76 2/7/2023 3:10:17 PM 1 1
Position source type Receiver Name Latitude Longitude Altitude Horizontal Accuracy (m) Vertical Accuracy (m) Fix Time Fix Type Correction Age Station ID	2 Samsung SM-N950U 39.690871 -79.627908 436.8 4.7 3.76 2/7/2023 3:10:17 PM 1 1 \$\Null>
Position source type Receiver Name Latitude Longitude Altitude Horizontal Accuracy (m) Vertical Accuracy (m) Fix Time Fix Time Fix Type Correction Age Station ID Number of Satellites	2 Samsung SM-N950U 39.690871 -79.627908 436.8 4.7 3.76 2/7/2023 3:10:17 PM 1 1 <null> Null&gt;</null>
Position source type Receiver Name Latitude Longitude Altitude Horizontal Accuracy (m) Vertical Accuracy (m) Vertical Accuracy (m) Fix Time Fix Type Correction Age Station ID Number of Satellites PDOP	2 Samsung SM-N950U 39.690871 -79.627908 436.8 4.7 3.76 2/7/2023 3:10:17 PM 1 <null> <null> 10 1.3</null></null>
Position source type Receiver Name Latitude Longitude Altitude Horizontal Accuracy (m) Vertical Accuracy (m) Fix Time Fix Type Correction Age Station ID Number of Satellites PDOP HDOP	2 Samsung SM-N950U 39.690871 -79.627908 436.8 4.7 3.76 2/7/2023 3:10:17 PM 1 1 \$ Null> \$ Null> 10 1.3 1 1
Position source type Receiver Name Latitude Longitude Altitude Horizontal Accuracy (m) Vertical Accuracy (m) Fix Time Fix Type Correction Age Station ID Number of Satellites PDOP HDOP	2 Samsung SM-N950U 39.690871 -79.627908 436.8 4.7 3.76 2/7/2023 3:10:17 PM 1 1 <null> 10 1.3 1.3 1 0.8</null>
Position source type Receiver Name Latitude Longitude Altitude Horizontal Accuracy (m) Vertical Accuracy (m) Fix Time Fix Time Fix Type Correction Age Station ID Number of Satellites PDOP HDOP VDOP	2 Samsung SM-N950U 39.690871 -79.627908 436.8 4.7 3.76 2/7/2023 3:10:17 PM 1 1 <null> 10 1.3 1 1.3 1 0.8</null>
Position source type Receiver Name Latitude Longitude Altitude Horizontal Accuracy (m) Vertical Accuracy (m) Vertical Accuracy (m) Fix Time Fix Type Correction Age Station ID Number of Satellites PDOP HDOP HDOP VDOP	2 Samsung SM-N950U 39.690871 -79.627908 436.8 4.7 3.76 2/7/2023 3:10:17 PM 1 1 <null> 10 1.3 1 0.8 0 0</null>
Position source type Receiver Name Latitude Longitude Altitude Horizontal Accuracy (m) Vertical Accuracy (m) Vertical Accuracy (m) Fix Time Fix Type Correction Age Station ID Number of Satellites PDOP HDOP HDOP VDOP Direction of travel (°) Speed (km/h) Compass reading (°)	2 Samsung SM-N950U 39.690871 -79.627908 436.8 4.7 3.76 2/7/2023 3:10:17 PM 1 <null> <null> 10 1.3 1.0 0.8 0 0 0 0 294.317192</null></null>
Position source type Receiver Name Latitude Longitude Altitude Horizontal Accuracy (m) Vertical Accuracy (m) Vertical Accuracy (m) Fix Time Fix Time Fix Type Correction Age Station ID Number of Satellites PDOP HDOP DOP DOP DOP Direction of travel (*) Speed (km/h) Compass reading (*) Average Horizontal Accuracy (m)	2 Samsung SM-N950U 39.690871 -79.627908 436.8 436.8 4.7 3.76 2/7/2023 3:10:17 PM 1 1 <null> 1 <null> 10 1.3 1 0.8 0 0 0 0 294.317192 <null></null></null></null>
Position source type Receiver Name Latitude Longitude Altitude Altitude Horizontal Accuracy (m) Vertical Accuracy (m) Fix Time Fix Time Fix Type Correction Age Station ID Number of Satellites PDOP HDOP HDOP DOP Direction of travel (*) Speed (km/h) Compass reading (*) Average Horizontal Accuracy (m)	2 Samsung SM-N950U 39.690871 -79.627908 436.8 436.8 4.7 3.76 2/7/2023 3:10:17 PM 1 1 4 Null> 10 1.3 1 0 1.3 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 294.317192 4 Null>
Position source type Receiver Name Latitude Longitude Altitude Altitude Horizontal Accuracy (m) Vertical Accuracy (m) Fix Time Fix Type Correction Age Station ID Number of Satellites PDOP HDOP HDOP DOP DOP Direction of travel (°) Speed (km/h) Compass reading (°) Average Horizontal Accuracy (m) Average Vertical Accuracy (m)	2 Samsung SM-N950U 39.690871 -79.627908 436.8 436.8 4.7 3.76 2/7/2023 3:10:17 PM 1 1 <null> 1 0 1.3 1 1 0 1.3 1 0 0 0 0 294.317192 <null> 3 4 Null&gt; 3 4 1 1 2 4 3 1 1 2 3 4 3 1 1 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 3 4 3</null></null>