TOS → ACE

> > To: 'barker' <barker@direct.ca>
> > Sent: Thursday, September 28, 2000 10:49 AM
> > Subject: Ace Thesis
> >
> >
> > > Hi Louis,
> > >
> > > Thanks again for the thesis, he has some great figures and data. I am
> > > incorporating the geochemical data with mine and Jason's, but am
> wondering
> > > where the thesis samples were collected. Do you have a file with the
> > > locations (even descriptions are fine)? Also, Appendix B with
Daniel's
> > > core logs was not included. Do you have this file?
> > >
> > > Did you send this to Tosh? He might find it interesting to look
through
> > > too.
> > >
> > > Just quickly going through the data sets I am finding some interesting
> > > things:
> > > -the Quesnel gneiss does not seem to be related to the felsic
volcanics
> on
> > > the property
> > > -the Ace host is a dacite (not quite as mafic as an andesite as Daniel
> > > suggests, though they do plot in the andesite field on that particular
> > plot)
> > > -the Frank Creek felsic host rock is a rhyolite
> > > -the host of the Big Gulp is a dacite somewhat similar to Ace
> > > -the Frank Creek mafics are alkalic basalts-important for
reconstructing
> > the
> > > tectonic regime at the time of formation (Bathurst Camp has an alkalic
> > suite
> > > (mafic and felsic) in the hangingwall of the ore deposits)
> > > -the Ace dacite appears to be quite altered; silicified, chloritized,
> > > sericitized, carbonate
> > > -the few samples from the Frank Creek rhyolite show less alteration
(may
> > > reflect sample collection), but are still moderately altered
> > > -the various units that Daniel broke out for the Ace area appear to
be,
> in
> > > general, the same chemical unit although a more felsic package occurs
> > within
> > > (trying to figure out where on the map these samples plot)
> > >
> > > These are some of the preliminary conclusions I can make from the
> > > geochemistry. The sample locations will help to pull apart more info
> for
> > > the Ace area.
> > >
> > > Thanks,
> > > Noelle
> > >
> > >