

Hintze

DOCUMENT REVIEW APPRAISAL FORM

Mapping Section
Utah Geological Survey
2363 Foothill Drive
Salt Lake City, Utah 84109-1491

Grant C. Willis, Document Review Coordinator

Name of map or document: Skinner Peak Quad

Name of author(s): Tracy Felger

Name of reviewer: Lehi Hintze Date: 20 Jan 92

IF YOU CANNOT REVIEW THIS DOCUMENT WITHIN ONE MONTH, PLEASE RETURN IT IMMEDIATELY.

The provided materials are for you to mark. The following questions will provide guidelines as to what the UGS feels is important with respect to its maps and documents. Our 7 1/2' quadrangle map series is intended to be multi-purpose, treat Quaternary rocks with the same importance as bedrock units, and provide a brief, not comprehensive, discussion of stratigraphy, structure, economic geology, water resources, and geologic hazards. Your review of this document is greatly appreciated.

Thank you very much.

MAP AND CROSS SECTION REVIEW:

1. Are the map elements logical and consistent with common usage? (If not, please indicate suggested revisions on the map or below):

yes, few minor areas not labeled
some dotted faults omitted and some
probably improperly located.

2. Are the cross sections clear and consistent with the cross section line? Are the interpretations logical? see below
Is the cross section positioned in the best place to show structural relationships? yes Is the cross section shown at a 1:1 vertical to horizontal scale (vertical exaggeration on the main cross sections is not acceptable in UGS maps; additional vertically exaggerated cross sections can be added to show unique features)? not needed Is the cross section deep enough, or too deep? Are additional cross sections necessary? no

Comments: 1) additional faults may better explain relations on both AA' and BB'
2) There is probably a buried QT unit on BB' under
 Junk Valley

3. Are all symbols used on maps and cross-sections explained or covered in the explanations and legends. Are the age relationships correct, are all units described. Are some things omitted that should be there?

OK

4. Do you have other comments you wish to make about the map, cross-section(s), legends and explanations?

few ^{labels} missing on map and crosssections

TEXT REVIEW:

1. Is the organization of the text satisfactory?

generally - Bot a Table of contents would have helped the author improve her organization

2. Is the introductory material adequate?

3. Is the stratigraphy section complete and adequate? Are thicknesses and ages of units as narrowly defined as possible? Redundant writing
Needs standard headings based on map unit names

4. Is the structure section complete and adequate? Includes unnecessary regional generalizations not specifically tied to this quad

5. Is the economic geology section adequate for this map? OK

6. Are the geologic hazards adequately addressed?

7. Is the Quaternary geology adequately presented?

8. UGS publications are intended to be used by both geologists and non-geologists. As such, they should include the technical information and terminology needed by the geologist as well as enough general information to help the non-geologist get a feel for the basics of the area. However it is not expected that the non-geologist be able to understand everything. Does this document meet this "multi-user" standard? Comments? _____

Perhaps over-referenced to generally unavailable theses

9. Could the text be shortened without detriment, and if so, how? Do additional sections need to be added?

Could be shortened by 30 to 50% very redundant writing style

10. Are the illustrations, tables and their captions necessary and adequate?

Needs index map, better strat column

11. Is sufficient credit given to prior work?

to some extent

12. Are the references necessary and adequate?

not all are necessary

13. What other revisions do you recommend?

~~delete~~ rewrite

14. Please note your additional comments or suggestions: