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Since 1972 when the Alaska Division of Geological & Geophysical Surveys’ (DGGS) current name and governing statutes were established, and even before 1959 as the Territorial Department of Mines, the State geological survey has created, compiled, and distributed copious information on the State’s complex geology and the mineral potential of Alaska’s lands. This work fulfills DGGS’s mission to encourage the exploration, development, and production of Alaska’s mineral resources that bring revenue to the State and create high-paying jobs. As of September 1, 2017, DGGS released its 5,000th publication, which equates to an average publication rate of one new product every four business days since statehood in 1959. DGGS and other agency publications are available at http://dggs.alaska.gov/publications. Currently, DGGS is developing interactive online applications to increase data discoverability and compiling statewide datasets that companies can download and use to develop exploration targets. Examples include:

**NEW** Alaska geochemistry: http://doi.org/10.14509/geochem
Unpublished geoscience information (AGDI): http://doi.org/10.14509/agdi
Geophysical surveys: http://doi.org/10.14509/gp
Geologic map index: http://doi.org/10.14509/mapindex

DGGS endeavors to create products that deliver information essential to the mineral industry’s discovery of economic mineral deposits. To use our resources most effectively, DGGS seeks detailed feedback from the mineral industry regarding (1) the types of geologic data most helpful for discovering mineral properties and (2) the digital data formats most compatible with companies’ business processes and preferred software.

Furthermore, both DGGS and industry need access to high-quality basemap layers, geophysics, remote-sensing imagery, and other geospatial information. Increasing communication within the mineral industry/geosciences community regarding the kinds of data we want, and proactively determining how to obtain, disseminate, and pay for them will help everyone achieve their goals more quickly. Examples of industry and agency partnerships include cooperatively funded airborne geophysical surveys, the State elevation data portal (http://elevation.alaska.gov), DGGS’ Geologic Materials Center sample inventory (http://maps.dggs.alaska.gov/gmc), and DGGS-published maps and datasets incorporating State-funded and industry-donated information. Leveraging resources, especially in times of decreased funding and limited investment capital, helps all of us.

The Alaska Miners Association fall conference is the premier venue to discuss industry’s Alaska-specific data needs. DGGS encouraged company and agency representatives and other stakeholders to participate in live polls and discussion during the presentation on the following topics:

• To what geologic and geospatial data do you wish you had access?
• What digital data formats are most useful for spatial and non-spatial data?
• What are the best platforms used by you to discover new datasets?
• What platform would most encourage communication within the mineral industry/geosciences community?
- What factors hinder communication and collaboration in the community?
- Are there State policies that could be made or changed to facilitate data creation or information sharing?
- What steps can we take now to promote the leveraging of our resources?

The poll questions were also generously posted by the Alaska Miners Association on the event app and social media. If you have not already done so, please consider answering the questions online at https://www.zeeetings.com/DGGS/0003-8757-0001 or contact DGGS directly with your thoughts and ideas.
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The following slides display responses to poll questions that were asked during the Building Digital Infrastructure presentation on Thursday morning, November 9. Responses are compiled here through December 8, 2017.

The Alaska Miners Association also generously posted the poll questions via the event app and on social media.

DGGS is very interested to hear thoughts and ideas from the mineral industry. The poll questions may be answered online at https://www.zeetings.com/DGGS/0003-8757-0001 or contact Jen Athey directly at 907.451.5028.
DGGS’ mission: Determine the potential of Alaskan land for production of metals, minerals, fuels, and geothermal resources, the locations and supplies of groundwater and construction material, and the potential geologic hazards to buildings, roads, bridges, and other installations and structures (AS 41.08.020).
How often do you access DGGS' website <http://www.dggs.alaska.gov>?

- **A** Never been there: 19% (6 of 32 responses)
- **B** 1–3 times a year: 34% (11 of 32 responses)
- **C** Monthly: 34% (11 of 32 responses)
- **D** Weekly: 13% (4 of 32 responses)

32 Responses
Did you successfully find the data you were looking for on DGGS' website?

- **84%** (21 of 24 responses)
- **16%** (4 of 24 responses)

25 Responses
DGGS provides access to more than 14,300 publications, 231 GIS datasets, and 12 interactive maps.

http://dggs.alaska.gov/publications/
How do you use geologic map data?

1. I use paper maps.
   - 68 of 135 total responses
   - 50% Disagree
   - 50% Agree

2. I use map images on my field devices and in GIS.
   - 101 of 135 total responses
   - 75% Disagree
   - 25% Agree

3. I use GIS databases and make my own custom maps.
   - 103 of 135 total responses
   - 76% Disagree
   - 24% Agree

27 Responses
What geologic data formats work best for you? (may select more than one)

- **PDF downloads**: 17 of 28 responses (22%)
- **Spreadsheets or databases**: 15 of 28 responses (19%)
- **GIS shapefiles**: 17 of 28 responses (22%)
- **Esri GIS geodatabases**: 16 of 28 responses (21%)
- **Web mapping applications**: 9 of 28 responses (12%)
- **Web services like WFS and WMS**: 3 of 28 responses (4%)
The new Alaska geochemical database contains 63,679 samples, with 74,929 analyses of those samples from 221 publications.

http://doi.org/10.14509/geochem
Sample Detail
Sample Number: 368 (in USBM OFR 1-92)

Sample Documentation
Datum: NAD27
Accuracy: 50 m
Latitude: 62.152173162
Longitude: -147.404315588
Sample: Placer concentrate; 0.1 cubic yard; Alluvium
Field Station Number: 368 (in USBM OFR 1-92)

Analyses [Download All]
Reference Number: OFR 1-92-1
Citation: OFR 1-92
Laboratory: Chemex Labs, Inc.
Description: Gravimetric recovery of gold and platinum was performed before the remaining portion was ground to a 140 mesh. Pan concentrates were analyzed by atomic fluorescence for gold, platinum, and palladium, and inductively coupled plasma for all other elements analyzed.
Sample Type: other

http://doi.org/10.14509/geochem
Alaska’s geological database
- Ranks 32 out of 106 countries
- 60% successful at encouraging investment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland &amp; Labrador</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland, Republic of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How do you currently find out about new DGGS products?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conferences/meetings</td>
<td>147 of 175 total responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>115 of 175 total responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual internet browsing</td>
<td>112 of 175 total responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td>108 of 175 total responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>90 of 175 total responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>70 of 175 total responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSS feeds</td>
<td>58 of 175 total responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Responses: 25
DGGS concentrates on providing 1:63,360-scale geologic mapping and supporting data in high-mineral-potential areas
What style of geologic mapping would help you the most? (select one)

A. Smaller-scale mapping than 1:63,360 - 17% 4 of 24 responses

B. Concentrate on a specific mineral region - 21% 5 of 24 responses

C. More geochemical sampling, less mapping - 13% 3 of 24 responses

D. Quick map turnaround time with less detail - 4% 1 of 24 responses

E. I like what you are doing now! - 46% 11 of 24 responses
What data do you wish DGGS provided, or would like us to provide in the future?

Comments during or after the 2017 AMA presentation:

• Provide abandoned core rescue services, too much information rots away in alder choked backlots.
  ○ I agree. It would make sense to collect this core.
• Reference library of pulps/reject material that is available for analysis.
• Provide detailed geologic mapping and regional concepts throughout the state.
• Create KML/KMZ map images that I can bring into Google Earth.
• Paper mapping is dead. Or, will be soon enough.
Alaska is a big state. How can we leverage our resources to get the data we need?

- Funds – geophysical surveys
- Data – reports and maps
- Samples & core – donations to the GMC
- Data portals – Alaska elevation data
- Networking – consortia to complete goals
What platform would you want to use to communicate with others in the mineral industry/geosciences community? (select one)

- **A** In-person meetings and conferences
  - 20% (5 of 25 responses)

- **B** Slack
  - 8% (2 of 25 responses)

- **C** LinkedIn group
  - 24% (6 of 25 responses)

- **D** Facebook group
  - 12% (3 of 25 responses)

- **E** Listserv or email group
  - 36% (8 of 25 responses)

25 Responses
Comments from during and after the 2017 AMA presentation:

What factors hinder communication and collaboration in the community?
My company asked me not to share some publicly available data at AMA.

Are there State policies that could be made or changed to facilitate data creation or information sharing?
- Submit industry data like the Canadian model. Working in Alaska is expensive and starting at square one every time is not progressive.
- Help determine DNR stake/coordinates lease ownership boundaries.
- DNR is using a different datum than I do, and it’s is making it difficult for me to know where my claim boundaries are really located.
- I would like the State to provide paperless, online claim staking.

What steps can we take now to promote the leveraging of our resources?
An Esri Mining User Group (MUG) could be a starting point for sharing ideas and data.
Thank you for your feedback. Please contact DGGS with questions or comments.

For more information, contact Jen Athey at Jennifer.Athey@Alaska.gov, 907.451.5028
The following slides display responses to additional poll questions that were asked during the Data Innovations session on Thursday morning, November 9.
What is your job's focus? (select one)

A. Mineral exploration - 41% (7 of 17 responses)
B. Land management - 18% (3 of 17 responses)
C. Support industry - 6% (1 of 17 responses)
D. Science agency - 6% (1 of 17 responses)
E. Mine operations - 18% (3 of 17 responses)
F. Data or imagery contractor - 6% (1 of 17 responses)
G. Investor - 0% (0 of 17 responses)
H. Politician - 0% (0 of 17 responses)
I. Other - 6% (1 of 17 responses)

17 Responses
Do you use GIS? (select one)

A. Yes, I do.
   14 of 16 responses (88%)

B. I want to.
   0 of 17 responses (0%)

C. Someone in my office does it for me.
   2 of 16 responses (13%)

D. We don't use GIS.
   0 of 17 responses (0%)

16 Responses
What GIS software do you or your company use? (may select more than one)

- **A. Esri**: 13 of 20 responses
- **B. MapInfo**: 4 of 20 responses
- **C. QGIS**: 2 of 20 responses
- **D. Other open source**: 1 of 20 responses
- **E. CAD**: 3 of 20 responses
- **F. Google Earth**: 12 of 20 responses
- **G. Other**: 3 of 20 responses

20 Responses
Have you used the IfSAR data? DEM?

- Yes: 65% (11 of 17 responses)
- No: 35% (6 of 17 responses)

Are you active in collecting lidar in the state?

- Yes: 24% (4 of 17 responses)
- No: 76% (13 of 17 responses)
What data did you recently want to use but couldn't find?

- Yearly snapshots of state and federal claim maps.
- Publicly available still (?) logs
- Oil and gas wells
- Updated higher accuracy Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM) elevation data, but it does not exist north of Anchorage.
What technological advances in mapping do you want to know more about? (may select more than one)

A. UAVs 15% 2 of 5 responses
B. Mobile mapping 15% 2 of 5 responses
C. Web service, like web mapping service 8% 1 of 5 responses
D. Gigapan cameras 0% 0 of 5 responses
E. High accuracy GPS 23% 3 of 5 responses
F. Laser ranger finders 0% 0 of 5 responses
G. Lidar 31% 4 of 5 responses
H. Virtual Reality 8% 1 of 5 responses

5 Responses