

3D/4D modeling, visualization and information frameworks: current US Geological Survey practice and needs

P. Glynn^a, L. Jacobsen^a, G. Phelps^a, Gerald Bawden^a, V. Grauch^a, R. Orndorff^a, R. Winston^a, M. Fienen^a, V. Cross^a and J. Bratton^b

^aUS Geological Survey, ^bNational Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, *pglynn@usgs.gov

ABSTRACT

Progress is being made in the ability to visualize and model geologic data and information in 3 spatial dimensions (3D) and sometimes adding time for 4 dimensions (4D). These abilities are enriching the conceptual models and process simulations constructed by geologists and hydrogeologists. Computer technology is also enhancing the visualization and modeling of landscapes and the hydrodynamic simulations of surface waters. Progress needs to be made in visualizing and coupling geologic, hydrologic, atmospheric, and biologic processes together into 3D/4D information frameworks that encompass and integrate observations and simulations across a diversity of spatial and temporal scales and data types. Achieving progress in these areas will also enhance the relevance and effective communication of USGS science to policy makers and to the lay public

INTRODUCTION

We need to gain abilities to visualize and model our dynamic multi-dimensional earth. Natural processes are 3D/4D in character, yet many people increasingly access the natural world through 2D screens and visualize and simulate reality through 2D or 1D representations. Current 3D modeling and visualization efforts often consist of 2D map/GIS overlays stacked in 3D space that only provide a limited extension of the geological realities perceived by Nicholas Steno in 1669. Static block diagrams and other 2D visuals do not allow efficient exploration of the rich multi-dimensional datasets and knowledge they portray. Why should we, and how can we, advance our visualization and modeling of information frameworks to a new level of perceived reality? Plato described this need in his allegory of the cave, referring to the “philosopher” as someone who was able to escape a 2D world of shadows. Current capabilities and practice in using 3D/4D visualization/modeling tools vary widely across the US Geological Survey (USGS). Our presentation (1) considers different types of 3D/4D visualization and modeling efforts currently conducted in the USGS, (2) highlights some interdisciplinary possibilities for future efforts and science applications, including the more effective communication of USGS science and the implications of alternative management scenarios to policy makers and to the lay public and finally (3) comments on desired software capabilities of a general information framework for 3D/4D modeling and visualization.

3D/4D GEOLOGIC APPLICATIONS

Current USGS geologic applications for 3D/4D visualization and modeling include:

- Paleoseismic frameworks and tectonic models to assess past tectonic displacements, earthquake potential, and fault-slip scenarios;
- Geologic models to define, assess, and bound resources and/or lithologic properties (water, oil, gas, minerals, porosity, rock chemistry...);
- Geophysical inverse models to visualize/characterize anomalous properties in the earth's crust;
- Volcanic models to describe magmatically driven bulging or to predict eruption types and timing;
- Deformation models showing landform subsidence or rebound caused by removal or additions of resources;
- Geomorphic analyses to detect/quantify landscape changes and structural features (e.g., faults, landslides, debris flows, paleo-floods, glaciers, impact craters).

Recently published USGS 3D geologic maps and databases (e.g. Phelps et al., 2008; Faith et al., 2010; Pantea et al., 2011) go beyond traditional geologic mapping. They provide a more complete characterization of features (e.g., units, faults, unconformities, structures, physical and chemical properties) and also describe the methods and techniques used. The descriptions are needed because 3D geologic mapping updates and adds to the conventional scientific methods for 2D mapping. 3D maps and models also define some features solely on geophysical expressions and include a discussion of the data and model(s) used in constructing the map.

3D/4D SURFACE-MAPPING APPLICATIONS

3D and 4D analyses and visualization of LiDAR (Light Detection And Ranging) imagery are frequently used in the USGS. LiDAR data are displayed, checked and corrected in immersive, virtual-reality, environments that comprise

hardware 3D display technology (e.g., Keck¹ Caves) and LiDAR viewing software. LiDAR and remote-sensing measurements and analyses can help determine the impact, frequency of occurrence and the future impacts, of earthquakes, debris flows, fires, floods and other disturbances that have modified, or could modify, the land surface, its vegetative cover, water resources, and/or human infrastructure. For example, repeat ultra-high resolution (sub-centimeter) 3D ground-based LiDAR imagery was collected in the days and months following the magnitude 6.0 Parkfield earthquake in central California. Immersive, virtual reality, 4D analysis (Kreylos et al., 2006, Kellogg et al., 2008) of the land surface and engineered structures illuminated small active tectonic geomorphic features that would have been overlooked in a 2D analysis.

Airborne and ground-based LiDAR are also commonly used in the detection of potentially hazardous faults and to assess structure and surface stability after landslides, rockslides, and debris flows. Detailed 3D/4D analyses are used to characterize these events, understand their driving mechanisms, and provide rapid feedback to local authorities regarding post-event stability of the land surface. Visualization tools, coupled with “before and after” landscape surveys, through remote sensing or LiDAR, are being used to benchmark current landscape conditions and help characterize and model the magnitude and extent of atmospheric events in terms of natural hazards, water availability, ecosystem response, and long-term climatic variability. At local scales, these technologies are used with biomorphic imaging of trees, roots or forest canopies to improve understanding of subsurface and surface relations between species, soils, geomorphic changes, solar fluxes and ecological productivity.

SURFACE HYDROLOGY APPLICATIONS

The USGS conducts work visualizing and predicting the impacts of sea level rise and salinity intrusion on coastal habitats. Although fixed-level 3D flood maps provide a first cut interpretation of the consequences of floods or sea level rise, 4D renderings are used to describe/model flood waves, storm surges, tsunamis, tidal surges, and outflows. Deterministic, predictive models based on mathematical descriptions of both, the operative physical processes and mass and energy conservation relations, are often displayed using advanced visualization systems to enhance dynamic patterns that would not otherwise be apparent. These models are vital to understanding the effects of storm surges on coastal wetlands or in predicting the potential impact and movement of hazardous spills or biomass (e.g., red tides). Numerical simulation models, often with associated 3D/4D visualization tools, have also been used to understand the dynamics of contaminant transport in Boston Harbor and Massachusetts Bay (Blumberg et al., 1993); and to simulate and understand water transport, nutrient cycling and ecological responses in the San Francisco Bay/Delta estuary (Lucas et al., 1999, 2009; <http://cascade.wr.usgs.gov/index.shtml>), in Upper Klamath Lake (Wood et al., 2008), and in the Florida Everglades (e.g., Larsen and Harvey, 2010).

The dynamically changing cryosphere presents complex environments, including permafrost and surging glaciers, with significant challenges to our understanding. The rapidly changing landforms, vegetation, and hydrology of arctic landscapes with warming temperatures and disappearing permafrost offers an example of the need for more integrated 3D/4D modeling, visualization and interpretations across traditional disciplines in the physical and biological sciences and also coupling surface and subsurface processes. As the areal distribution of permafrost decreases, there is increased hydrologic connectivity between surface water and groundwater, that in turn changes the landscape, the distribution of vegetation, and the fluxes of nutrients and carbon to the rivers, sea, and atmosphere. The USGS also has a long-standing study of the Bering Glacier, which surges approximately every 20 years (e.g. Molnia and Post, 2010). Repeat 4D ground-based Tripod-LiDAR imagery of pressure ridges and on the glacier toe were collected to help understand and show the dynamic processes of the 2011 Bering Glacier surge.

GROUNDWATER APPLICATIONS

The USGS extensively uses 3D/4D visualization (e.g., Model Viewer: Hsieh and Winston, 2002) and modeling tools to simulate subsurface flow and contaminant transport. These tools are essential in:

- Representing and checking the primary data and information in a geologic context;
- Visualizing lithologic units and the spatial distribution and temporal evolution of hydrogeologic and chemical properties associated with lithologic properties (e.g., primary and secondary porosities, permeability, mineralogy) and/or with structural features such as active faults, fractures, joints, channels, and folds;
- Integrating hydrologic, chemical, or geophysical response information to help determine the spatial distribution of hydrogeologic or lithologic properties in various subsurface zones through “inverse modeling” numerical simulations;

¹ Any use of trade, product, or firm names is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

- Using predictive or “forward” modeling to numerically simulate the potential movement of water, solutes, contaminants, colloids, viruses, or bacteria in the subsurface, and the coupled evolution of the hydrogeologic environment.

Both groundwater availability and groundwater contamination studies in the USGS focus mostly on the shallow subsurface, which is usually the source of groundwater resources for irrigation or drinking water. Hydrogeologic studies of deeper environments are mostly confined to sites that might be suitable for the disposal of nuclear wastes or the injection of other industrial wastes, however, this situation is rapidly changing. Developments in energy resource extraction increasingly necessitate geologic/hydrogeologic studies of the deep subsurface. These developments include: (1) the extraction of shale gas through the use of hydrofracking, (2) the potential development of oil shale resources through in-situ retorting, and (3) the deep-injection of waste fluids associated with energy resource extraction. There is also the potential for using deep geologic formations, specifically former oil and gas reservoirs, coal seams, and saline aquifers for geologic carbon sequestration. Finally, brackish and saline groundwater is increasingly recognized as a potential source of water, due to technical advances and cheaper costs of desalination technology (Alley, 2003).

There are a number of remote sensing approaches that are useful to assess groundwater fluctuations, water withdrawals, and their associated impacts at both global and local scales. At regional to global scales, terrestrial water storage-change observations from the NASA GRACE (Gravity Recovery and Climate Experiment) satellites have been used to estimate groundwater depletion in the US and in the Indian states of Rajasthan, Punjab and Haryana (Rodell et al, 2009). Groundwater withdrawals not only impact water sustainability in semi-arid environments but also can adversely impact surface water resources in humid climates, produce substantial land subsidence, damage infrastructure, and irreversibly decrease an aquifer's ability to store water. At smaller regional scales, repeat satellite InSAR (Interferometric Synthetic Aperture Radar) imagery of active hydrocarbon fields shows how the land surface responds to hydrocarbon removal and CO₂ and water injection over time. At local scales, high resolution imagery from a suite of observational technologies_ including InSAR, airborne LiDAR, ground-based Tripod LiDAR, and GPS_ can be fused to characterize the surface deformation through time associated with pumping of groundwater at depth. In all these studies, 3D/4D visualization can help us understand what areas are at the greatest risk, what areas are being most depleted of a groundwater or energy resource, and can also be used in optimization modeling to more efficiently manage and distribute pumping and recharge in a given area. More generally, 3D/4D visualization tools can also be used to effectively communicate the implications of scientific research and assessments, and the potential results of alternative resource management scenarios, to policy makers and to the lay public.

OTHER APPLICATIONS OF 3D/4D MODELING

Collaboration among scientists who often do not have the same scientific disciplinary backgrounds, and therefore lack a common scientific language, can be made easier through the use of advanced 4D immersive visualization systems. The USGS needs to extend its individual capabilities in 3D earth science modeling and visualization to provide greater understanding and integration of coupled processes for scientific research and assessments of natural resources and hazards. It also needs to consider and potentially include the 3D/4D visualization and simulation of atmospheric and biologic processes. For example, understanding orographic processes, their effects on precipitation intensity, duration and type (rain, hail, snow), and the interplay with vegetation and ecosystem dynamics with geomorphic processes, can help explain and/or predict the impacts of ecosystem disturbances (e.g., fire, drought, floods, debris flows). Communicating such understanding can help regulators and policy makers better manage landscapes and natural resources in the face of changing land use and climate. Visualizing, understanding, and predicting the storage and flows of water, nutrients, contaminants, and sediments and their biological feedbacks can help mitigate the damages caused by natural disturbances and can also help society make better decisions on how and where to exploit natural resources, where to place infrastructure, and how to minimize human impacts on the environment.

The interrelations of temperature and topography also affect our landscapes and associated ecosystems and their evolution in time. Visualizing and predicting temperature distributions across a mountainous landscape or watershed can help us understand biologic habitats and how they may change. Stream temperatures and their variability are extremely important to the health and population distribution of fish and other aquatic species. Such temperatures and their diurnal and seasonal variability are controlled by many factors that may include slope, slope aspect, shading, groundwater baseflows, stream flow, groundwater/spring temperatures, snowmelt contributions, albedo, air temperature, relative humidity, precipitation, microbial activity, and the number of animals crossing the stream or the extent of salmon spawning. Understanding and visualizing topographic and climatic drivers can help predict the movement and intensity of fires, the spread of pests or invasive species, and/or the migration or extinction of species. USGS scientists also routinely collect high-resolution 4D snow depth change data and combine the data with climate models to estimate daily snow melt runoff as a function of solar radiation and incident angle at various elevations.

Climate forecast models using 4D climate data and different global warming scenarios help understand how ecosystems and water availability might change in the future.

SOFTWARE NEEDS FOR 3D/4D INFORMATION FRAMEWORKS

Emerging needs for 3D/4D modeling and visualization in the USGS include fundamental capabilities to represent geologic, hydrologic, physico-chemical, and biologic information. There is also a need to integrate information across spatial and temporal scales and to better represent a wider array of natural processes, source information, and modeled information. To be most useful, 3D/4D visualization and modeling tools of the future will help:

- Display and validate raw scientific data collected in multi-dimensional, spatial frameworks and perform mathematical and statistical operations on the data, in real time;
- Represent, interpret, and possibly reconcile data and primary information collected non-synoptically;
- Display temporal changes in scientific information in an "animated" 4D framework (e.g., energy or material fluxes, disruptions in 3D structures or boundaries, or changes in the intensities of distributed characteristic properties);
- Integrate diverse types (e.g., point, line, areal, volumetric) of primary spatial information through time for any given property (e.g., porosity, permeability, physicochemical properties) or function in a 3D/4D visual environment while displaying not only the information but also the associated uncertainties and the information gaps;
- Conduct inverse, statistical, geostatistical, stochastic, or other types of modeling to create 3D/4D realizations of natural phenomena;
- Interpolate and extrapolate spatial and temporal values from observed data using a variety of methods and using interpreted and modeled information to build 3D/4D information frameworks, such as geologic mapping frameworks, that maximize the use of the knowledge available for a given issue or given spatial system;
- Maximize the ability to use the information for interpretive or predictive studies, simulations, and assessments;
- Derive and tie results and conclusions tightly to underlying databases;
- Maintain all data in non-proprietary formats for future use;
- Provide the ability for external users to add their own data and interpretations to USGS derived interpretations and data sets with full traceability, information security, and privacy controls where needed;
- Provide animations, fly-throughs, and data-discovery tools that help researchers individually or collaboratively advance their scientific understanding and communicate their results; and
- Allow scientists to communicate research, monitoring, and assessment findings and their implications, to each other, decision makers, and the greater public in a simple, cost effective, and timely manner.

FINAL COMMENTS

With greater capabilities and freedom in displaying, understanding, and extrapolating information come greater responsibilities in tracking, understanding, and evaluating the quality and uncertainties/biases of data and other primary information and of transformations that have been applied to that information. The technology to track, determine and evaluate information gaps, sources of error, and uncertainties needs to be integrated into the 3D/4D visualization and modeling tools of the future. At the same time, the assembly of information and the potential to efficiently examine and analyze large quantities of data will help provide QA/QC checks that were not available in the past and will help better manage and understand the data and primary information that are collected.

Improvements are needed in the integration of widely diverse information. Available data and observations often represent information integrated across very different spatial and temporal scales, and often across a different number of dimensions. Connecting these different scales and providing a consistent reconciliation of the information can only occur within a comprehensive encompassing framework, i.e., usually a 3D/4D information framework. Better techniques are also needed to construct coherent conceptual models from individual observations and from simulated or reconstructed information, process models, and intermediate scale models. Iterating among data collection, interpretation, and the application of forward, inverse, and statistical modeling tools is likely to provide progress in this area.

3D/4D visualization and modeling tools have the potential to display and discover information that will help (1) advance and communicate USGS science, (2) better manage natural geologic, hydrologic and biologic resources, (3) minimize undesired impacts in using those resources, (4) mitigate some of the consequences of natural hazards, and (5) make more informed decisions in societal planning (e.g. in the wise emplacement of human infrastructure).

REFERENCES

Alley, W.A. 2003. Desalination of Ground Water: Earth Science Perspectives: U.S. Geological Survey Fact Sheet 075-03, 4p.

- Blumberg, A.F., R.P. Signell and H.L. Jenter. 1993. Modeling Transport Processes in the Coastal Ocean: Journal of Environmental Engineering, Volume 1, pp 31-52.
- Faith, J.R., C.D. Blome, M.P. Pantea, J.O. Puckeete, N. Osborn, S. Christenson, S. Pack, and T. Halihan. 2010. Three-dimensional geologic model of the Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer, south-central Oklahoma: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2010-1123, Version 1.0, data storage CD.
- Hsieh, P.A. and R.B. Winston. 2002. User's Guide To Model Viewer, A Program For Three-Dimensional Visualization of Ground-water Model Results: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 02-106, 18 p. (<http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2002/ofr02-106/>)
- Kellogg, L.H., G.W. Bawden, T. Bernardin, M. Ballen, E. Cowgill, B. Hamann, M. Jadamec, O. Kreylos, O. Stadt and D.Y. Sumner. 2008. Interactive visualization to advance earthquake simulation: ACES Special Issue of Pure and Applied Geophysics, vol. 165, N3/4, (March/April).
- Kreylos, O., G.W. Bawden, T. Bernardin, M.I. Billen, E.S. Cowgill, R.D. Gold, B. Hamann, M. Jadamec, L.H. Kellogg, O.G. Stadt and D.Y. Sumner. 2006. Enabling scientific workflows in virtual reality, *in*: Hong Wong, K., and Baciu, G., eds., Proceedings of ACM International Conference on Virtual Reality Continuum and its Applications (VRCIA 2006): ACM Press, New York, New York, pp. 155-162.
- Larsen, L.G. and J.W. Harvey. 2010. How Vegetation and Sediment Transport Feedbacks Drive Landscape Change in the Everglades and Wetlands Worldwide: The American Naturalist, vol 176, no. 3, pp. E66-E79.
- Lucas, L.V., J.R. Koseff, S.G. Monismith, J.E. Cloern and J.K. Thompson. 1999. Processes governing phytoplankton blooms in estuaries II: the role of horizontal transport: Marine Ecology Progress Series, vol. 187, pp. 17-30.
- Lucas, L.V., L.R. Brown and J.K. Thompson. 2009. Why are diverse relationships observed between phytoplankton biomass and transport time? Limnology and Oceanography, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 381-390. http://www.aslo.org/lo/toc/vol_54/issue_1/0381.pdf
- Molnia, B. W. and A. Post. 2010. Surges of the Bering Glacier: Geological Society of America Special Papers 2010, vol. 462, pp. 291-316.
- Pantea, M.P., M.R. Hudson, V.J.S. Grauch and S.A. Minor. 2011. Three-dimensional geologic model of the southeastern Española basin, Santa Fe County, New Mexico: U. S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2011-5025, 17 p.
- Phelps, G.A., R.W. Graymer, R.C. Jachens, D.A. Ponce, R.W. Simpson and C.M. Wentworth. 2008. Three-dimensional geologic map of the Hayward fault zone, San Francisco Bay region, California: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Map 3045, 31 p.
- Rodell, M., I. Velicogna and J. Famiglietti. 2009. Satellite-based estimates of groundwater depletion in India: Nature, doi:10.1038/nature08238.
- Wood, T.M., R.T. Cheng, J.W. Gartner, G.R. Hoilman, M.K. Lindenberg and R.E. Wellman. 2008. Modeling hydrodynamics and heat transport in Upper Klamath Lake, Oregon, and implications for water quality: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2008-5076, 48 p. [<http://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2008/5076/>]



GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF CANADA

OPEN FILE 6998

Three-Dimensional Geological Mapping

WORKSHOP EXTENDED ABSTRACTS

Minneapolis, Minnesota – October 8, 2011

Conveners:

H.A.J. Russell,

R.C. Berg,

and L.H. Thorleifson

2011



Natural Resources
Canada

Ressources naturelles
Canada

Canada



GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF CANADA OPEN FILE 6998

Three-Dimensional Geological Mapping

WORKSHOP EXTENDED ABSTRACTS
Minneapolis, Minnesota – October 8, 2011
Conveners:

H.A.J. Russell, Geological Survey of Canada
R.C. Berg, Illinois State Geological Survey
L.H. Thorleifson, Minnesota Geological Survey



2011

©Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada 2011

doi:10.4095/G J1 €J

This publication is available from the Geological Survey of Canada Bookstore (<http://gsc.nrcan.gc.ca/bookstore>). It can also be downloaded free of charge from GeoPub (<http://geopub.nrcan.gc.ca/>).

Recommended citation:

Russell, H.A.J., Berg, R.C., and Thorleifson, L.H. (compilers) 2011. Three-Dimensional Geological Mapping. Geological Survey of Canada Open File 6998. 80 p.

Publications in this series have not been edited; they are released as submitted by the author.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION – THREE-DIMENSIONAL GEOLOGICAL MAPPING	iv
Russell, H.A.J., Berg, R.C., and Thorleifson, L.H.	
AIRBORNE ELECTROMAGNETIC SURVEYS FOR 3D GEOLOGICAL MAPPING.....	1
Jared D. Abraham and James C. Cannia	
THE USE OF 3D GEOLOGICAL INFORMATION IN A LARGE MANAGED AQUIFER RECHARGE PROJECT	7
Aki Artimo and Sami Saraperä	
APPROACHING A DECADE OF THREE- DIMENSIONAL MAPPING OF QUATERNARY SEDIMENTS IN SOUTHERN ONTARIO; A PROGRESS REPORT FROM THE ONTARIO GEOLOGICAL SURVEY	11
Andrew .F. Bajc, A.K. Burt and D.R.B. Rainsford	
3D MODELLING AT THE BAVARIAN STATE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY – EXAMPLES FOR COOPERATION TOWARDS 3D STANDARDS	17
Gerold W. Diepolder	
MULTIPLE-POINT GEOSTATISTICS FOR CREATION OF 3D HYDROSTRATIGRAPHIC MODELS, OUTAGAMIE COUNTY, WI.....	23
Kallina M. Dunkle, Mary P. Anderson, David J. Hart	
GEOLOGICAL AND PETROPHYSICAL 3D MODELLING OF SEDIMENTARY BASINS FOR GROUNDWATER APPLICATIONS, BRGM	29
Sunsearé Gabalda Christophe Rigollet, Olivier Serrano, Pascal Audigane, Christophe Chiaberge, Gabriel Courrioux, and Catherine Truffert	
3D/4D MODELING, VISUALIZATION AND INFORMATION FRAMEWORKS: CURRENT US GEOLOGICAL SURVEY PRACTICE AND NEEDS	33
Pierre Glynn, L. Jacobsen, G. Phelps, Gerald Bawden, V. Grauch, R. Orndorff, R. Winston, M. Fienen, V. Cross and J. Bratton	
3D GEOLOGICAL MAPPING IN MANITOBA – OVERVIEW AND PRODUCTS.....	39
Greg Keller Gaywood Matile, and L. Harvey Thorleifson	
3D GEOLOGICAL MAPPING (MODELLING) IN GEOLOGICAL SURVEY ORGANISATIONS AND THE NEW BRITISH GEOLOGICAL SURVEY INITIATIVE TO BUILD A NATIONAL GEOLOGICAL MODEL OF THE UK.	45
Steve Mathers	
INTEGRATED ENVIRONMENTAL MODELLING – THE NEW DREAM FOR GEOLOGICAL SURVEYS.....	49
Denis Peach, Andrew Hughes, Holger Kessler, Steve Mathers and Jerry Giles	
QUANTIFYING CORRELATION IN THREE-DIMENSIONAL GEOLOGIC MAPPING OF GLACIAL DRIFT	55
John J. Quinn and Howard D Moores	
FROM ATMOSPHERE TO BASEMENT: DEVELOPMENT OF A FRAMEWORK FOR GROUNDWATER ASSESSMENT IN CANADA	61
Hazen A. J. Russell, Alfonso Rivera, Shusen Wang, and David R. Sharpe	
GEOMODELING AT TNO – GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF THE NETHERLANDS	67
Jan Stafleu, Freek S. Busschers, Denise Maljers, Jan L. Gunnink and Michiel J. van der Meulen	

3D GROUNDWATER MAPPING IN DENMARK BASED ON CALIBRATED HIGH-RESOLUTION AIRBORNE GEOPHYSICAL DATA.....	73
Richard Thomsen,	
GEOLOGIC FRAMEWORK MODELING FOR GROUNDWATER APPLICATIONS IN NORTHEAST ILLINOIS.....	79
Jason F. Thomason, and Donald A Keefer	

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The efforts of Sally Denhart of the ISGS for maintaining the workshop website containing extended abstracts and PowerPoint presentations for the workshop series are much appreciated. An internal review by Charles Logan and Ross Knight is much appreciated. Thanks to N. St-Jean various formatting issues for the Open File release were rectified.

We thank the Geological Society of America for their logistical support and working with us to achieve the best possible venue and lowest costs.

Finally, we thank all of our presenters and their respective funding agencies and sources for making this Workshop a success. Publication of this proceedings was supported by the Groundwater Geoscience Program of the Geological Survey of Canada, the Illinois State Geological Survey, and the Minnesota Geological Survey.

INTRODUCTION – THREE-DIMENSIONAL GEOLOGICAL MAPPING

Russell¹, H.A.J., Berg², R.C., and Thorleifson³, L.H.

¹Geological Survey of Canada, ²Illinois State Geological Survey, ³Minnesota Geological Survey.

This workshop is the seventh in an ongoing series primarily designed to share insights among geological mappers who are maximizing the use of variable and often voluminous subsurface information in order to produce 3D models that map sediment and rock, with an emphasis on the needs of groundwater management. The first workshop in this series was held in Normal, Illinois, ten years ago this past April, (Berg and Thorleifson, 2001). This year's workshop reflects the evolving focus of the series from issues of data quality, datasets, and methods for data collection to a focus at the Geological Survey Organization level on institutional implementation of modelling standards at state, provincial, and national scales.

Since the 2009 workshop in Portland two notable outcomes of the workshop series have been published. Firstly, Thorleifson et al. (2010) discussed the emergence of 3D mapping at Geological Survey Organizations (GSO). Secondly, Berg et al. (2011) edited a collection of papers on approaches to 3D geological mapping at several geological survey organizations from Europe, North America, and Australia.

This year's workshop continues the trend of increased focus on work at GSOs with 11 of 15 contributions focused on this subject. The four remaining papers, however, maintain the essential link to research on methods.

1. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY ORGANIZATIONS

The 11 papers from national, state, and provincial GSOs reflect the differences in organization scale, human and financial resources, and mandates. Also evident are the different challenges presented by geographic scale, population density, and breadth of natural resource issues. Mathers from the BGS provides a brief overview of the edited volume by Berg et al. (2011) and continues in more detail on activities at the BGS. BGS work on an integrated modelling environment is further detailed by Peach. Four papers from Europe highlight activities in France (Gabalda et al), Holland (Stafleu), Germany (Diepolder) and Denmark (Thomsen). Gabalda et al. highlight work in sedimentary basins and an increasing demand for deeper models to support resource decisions. Stafleu presents an up-to-date account of modelling developments in Holland from existing surface models (DGM, REGIS-II) to voxel models (GeoTOP, NL3D) and database developments, as well as model dissemination via the web. Diepolder provides an overview of the responsibilities of GSOs in Germany and reviews work in various national and international modelling activities (GEOMOL, GST, and ProMine). Thomsen highlights a national program of groundwater investigation in Denmark, database development (GERDA) and the importance of data standards and geophysical data collection to provide a framework for groundwater protection.

The remaining GSO papers are from North America and review the situation at national, state, and provincial geological surveys. From the United States Geological Survey, Glynn reviews the scope and scale of demands for 3D geological information and also integrates the emerging need for data, modelling, and visualization in the fourth (time) dimension. A paper by Keller et al. highlights a collaborative effort between Manitoba and Minnesota and demonstrates what can be achieved with only minimal financial and human resources. Bajc et al. review progress in Southern Ontario and put emphasis on data collection (gravity) and modelling developments. Russell et al. provide an overview of work at the Geological Survey of Canada toward development of a hierarchical framework to support groundwater investigations in support of Canadian federal government priorities.

2. METHODS DEVELOPMENT

Four papers address methods development and concentrate on data collection and geostatistical approaches to modelling geological scenarios. Abraham and Thomason & Keefer both discuss survey design, processing, and integration of three dimensional data from airborne electromagnetic surveys, Abraham in Nebraska and Thomason & Keefer in Illinois. The value of airborne EM surveys is also discussed by Thomsen and the important contribution it is making to Danish subsurface modelling and to Russell et al. for the buried valleys in the prairie provinces of Canada. Gabalda et al. note the challenge of integrating geological heterogeneity into models and Dunkle et al. and Quinn & Moores both address this challenge through different geostatistical approaches. Dunkle presents a case study from Wisconsin applying multipoint geostatistics to map

preferential flow paths, and Quinn considers a number of questions regarding spatial heterogeneity in glacial sedimentary systems and effects of data quality and geostatistical approaches.

3. SUMMARY

The proceedings content provides an overview of the rapid evolution in three-dimensional geological mapping methods at government agencies. It is becoming clear that societal needs, particularly for effective groundwater management, are leading to more research and progress in areas of 3D data collection, modelling techniques, and data management.

References

- Berg, R.C., Mathers, S.J., Kessler, H., and Keefer, D. A., 2011. Synopsis of Current Three-dimensional Geological Mapping and Modeling in Geological Survey Organization, edited b1. Champaign, Illinois: Illinois State Geological Survey, Circular 578, www.isgs.illinois.edu.
- Berg, R. C., Thorleifson, L. H., (convenors) 2001. Geologic Models for Groundwater Flow Modeling: Workshop Extended Abstracts. Illinois State Geological Survey, Open File Series 2001-1, 62p. <http://www.isgs.uiuc.edu/research/3DWorkshop/index.shtml>)
- Thorleifson, L. H., Berg, R. C., and Russell, H.A.J. 2010 "Geological mapping goes 3-D in response to societal needs." GSA Today, no. 8 (August 2010): 27-29. <http://www.geosociety.org/gsatoday/archive/20/8/abstract/i1052-5173-20-8-27.htm>.