

From: Douglas Sprinkel
To: Bob Biek
Date: 7/18/2008 4:05 PM
Subject: Samples from New Mexico

CC: Bart Kowallis
Bob:

Bart and I have finally reviewed the results of the Ar-Ar dates from our samples analyzed at New Mexico. We were a little mystified by the samples that were not run and the reason for it. Lisa's explanation does not jive with our notes, and in some case, the summary table. Lisa's e-mailed the following with the summary table spreadsheet:

"I have attached a summary table. This table includes all of your samples submitted in October 2006 that we were able to date. We were unable to obtain datable material from quite a few of this batch. It is always challenging to obtain good dates from samples like those sent to us from Douglas Sprinkel/Bart Kowallis. We crushed and did preliminary work on all of their samples but in the end were unable to obtain separates we felt had a reasonable chance of yielding good data from samples: IP050806-2, NH091806-1, RW091906-1, 2005 Hanks 2, 8-8-2005-2, and Lake Powell Page S."

Based on our notes, it seems that Bart had prepared and sent vials of magnetic separates on the following samples: RF081606-1, NH091806-1, RW091906-1, 2005-Hanks-2, 8-8-2005-2, Kayenta Fm., East Bay, and Face Bay East. We could have sent whole rock samples as well but that does not seem likely. If we did send whole-rock samples with the separates, I suspect we ask NM to run the separates. We assumed the Face Bay and Face Bay East samples are what Lisa refers to as "Lake Powell Page S." This is baffling because the summary table does include dates from those samples and they are pretty good dates. We did not send any additional Page samples from Lake Powell. Now the batch of samples sent to NM could have included samples from Grants work but Lisa refers to them as our samples.

We did send three whole-rock samples (IP050806-2, PV111903-1, and PV111903-2) and ask NM to see if there is anything worth dating because Bart was not sure there was anything worth the effort and he did not have the time to prepare separates himself. It turns out that two sample were run and resulted in reasonably good dates.

One sample (RF081606-1) that NM ran resulted in a totally goofy date. This sample was a good crystal-rich tuff that we believe we sent separates. The Ar-Ar age is Callovian but the ash bed underlies a good marine mudstone that yielded a solid Bajocian age. A similar instance with our PV samples showed a preliminary date of ~145 in an e-mail from NM. The summary table spreadsheet shows the PV samples at 170 to 175, which is reasonable for ash beds in the Temple Cap Formation. Thus, I am curious if we are going to receive final reports. The summary table spreadsheet seems to be preliminary results according to Lisa's e-mail.

The bottom line is I want to send some of the samples to another lab. Bart has some material left on a couple of sample but not all. We could recollect the ash beds but I would like to ask NM to return any unused materials to us. Would you mind asking NM to return any material they may have left over? I ask that you not forward or include any part of this e-mail in your request since it seems that I am viewed as trouble maker and this e-mail would likely set NM off even more. I suspect this is all an honest misunderstanding since we batched samples from several UGS workers and the time it takes NM to process and run the samples could lend itself to this level of confusion.

Please request the return of materials from the following samples:

RF081606-1, NH091806-1, RW091906-1, 2005-Hanks-2, 8-8-2005-2, East Bay, and Face Bay East, IP050806-2, PV111903-1, and PV111903-2, and RF081606-1.

Thanks, Doug

Doug Sprinkel
Geologic Mapping Program
Utah Geological Survey
PO Box 146100
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-6100
or