

## GEOLOGIC INTERPRETATION OF DATA SETS COLLECTED BY PLANETARY ANALOG GEOLOGY TRAVERSES AND BY STANDARD GEOLOGIC FIELD MAPPING: A COMPARISON STUDY (PART 1)

**EPPLER, Dean B.**, Exploration Sciences Office, NASA Johnson Space Center, 2101 NASA Parkway, Houston, TX 77058, [dean.b.eppler@nasa.gov](mailto:dean.b.eppler@nasa.gov), BLEACHER, Jacob E., Planetary Geodynamics Laboratory, Code 698, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Building 33, Room G310, Greenbelt, MD 20771, EVANS, Cynthia A., NASA Johnson Space Center, Mail Code KT, 2101 NASA Parkway, Houston, TX 77058, FENG, Wanda, Departments of Geology and Astronomy, Smith College, Northampton, MA 01063, GRUENER, John, NASA, NASA Johnson Space Center, 2101 NASA Parkway, Houston, TX 77058, HURWITZ, Debra M., Lunar and Planetary Institute, 3600 Bay Area Boulevard, Houston, TX 77059, SKINNER, J.A. Jr, Astrogeology Team, U.S. Geological Survey, 2255 North Gemini Drive, Flagstaff, AZ 86001, WHITSON, Peggy, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Mail Code CB, NASA-Johnson Space Center, 2101 NASA Parkway, Houston, TX 77058, and JANOIKO, Barbara, NASA, Johnson Space Center, Mail Code EA3, NASA-Johnson Space Center, 2101 NASA Parkway, Houston, TX 77058

Geologic maps integrate the distributions, contacts, and compositions of rock and sediment bodies as a means to interpret local to regional formative histories. Applying terrestrial mapping techniques to other planets is challenging because data is collected primarily by orbiting instruments, with infrequent, spatially-limited *in situ* human and robotic exploration. Although geologic maps developed using remote data sets and limited "Apollo-style" field access likely contain inaccuracies, the magnitude, type, and occurrence of these are only marginally understood. This project evaluates the interpretative and cartographic accuracy of both field- and remote-based mapping approaches by comparing two 1:24,000 scale geologic maps of the San Francisco Volcanic Field (SFVF), north-central Arizona. The first map is based on traditional field mapping techniques, while the second is based on remote data sets, augmented with limited field observations collected during NASA Desert Research & Technology Studies (RATS) 2010 exercises. The RATS mission used Apollo-style methods not only for pre-mission traverse planning but also to conduct geologic sampling as part of science operation tests. Cross-comparison demonstrates that the Apollo-style map identifies many of the same rock units and determines a similar broad history as the field-based map. However, field mapping techniques allow markedly improved discrimination of map units, particularly unconsolidated surficial deposits, and recognize a more complex eruptive history than was possible using Apollo-style data. Further, the distribution of unconsolidated surface units was more obvious in the remote sensing data to the field team after conducting the fieldwork. The study raises questions about the most effective approach to balancing mission costs with the rate of knowledge capture, suggesting that there is an inflection point in the "knowledge capture curve" beyond which additional resource investment yields progressively smaller gains in geologic knowledge.

**Abstract ID#:** 226527

**Password:** 108346

**Meeting:** 2013 GSA Annual Meeting in Denver: 125th Anniversary of GSA (27-30 October 2013)

**Session Type:** Topical/Theme

**Selection:** T4. Geologic Mapping of Planetary Bodies across the Solar System