CRITERIA FOR DIFFERENTIATING THE TONGUE RIVER AND SENTINEL BUTTE FORMATIONS (PALEOCENE), NORTH DAKOTA

By Arthur F. Jacob

NORTH DAKOTA GEOLOGICAL SURVEY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION 53

NORTH DAKOTA GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

E. A. Noble, State Geologist

The work leading to this report was supported by several University of North Dakota Faculty Research Grants, the North Dakota Geological Survey, National Science Foundation Undergraduate Research Participation Grant GY 10699, and the North Dakota Water Resources Research Institute with funds provided by the United States Department of the Interior, Office of Water Resources Research, as authorized under the Water Resources Research Act of 1964, Public Law 88-379. Victor B. Cherven, William Fenner, Les Honeyman, Michael Maher, and James Van Alstine helped to collect the heavy-mineral data. Clarence G. Carlson and Lee Clayton read the original manuscript and made helpful criticisms.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT Page
INTRODUCTION 1
CRITERIA FOR DIFFERENTIATING THE TONGUE RIVER
AND SENTINEL BUTTE FORMATIONS 2
Criteria Useful for Surface Sections Only 2
Weathering and Topography 2
Criteria Useful for Surface or Subsurface Sections
Friability of Sandstone 2
Geometry of Sandstone Beds
Light Minerals
Heavy Minerals
Clay Minerals
Silicified Wood
SUMMARY
REFERENCES

ILLUSTRATIONS

Figu		I	?a	ge
1.	6 miles west of Fryburg, Billings County	•	•	3
2.	Sandstone bed in the Tongue River Formation near Medora			3
3.	Small caves and tunnels associated with steep-sided gulleys on the Sentinel Butte Formation just south of Garrison Dam on the east side of the Missouri River Valley		•	4
4,	Modern drying cracks on the surface of a sandstone bed in the Sentinel Butte Formation near Medora	•	•	4
5.	Folk's (1968) classification of sandstones used in this report			7
6.	Sandstones of the Tongue River Formation plotted according to triangle 1 of figure 5			8
7.	Sandstones of the Sentinel Butte Formation plotted according to triangle 1 of figure 5	•		9
8.	Sandstones of the Tongue River Formation plotted according to triangle 2 of figure 5	•	•	10
9.	Sandstones of the Sentinel Butte Formation plotted according to triangle 2 of figure 5		•	11
10.	Typical X-ray diffractogram of the clay-size fraction of the Tongue River Formation (from Emmanuel and Jacob, 1974)		•	12
11.	Typical X-ray diffractogram of the clay-size fraction of the Sentinel Butte Formation (from Emmanuel and Jacob, 1974)	•	•	12
Tabl	le			
1.	Some heavy mineral analyses of the Tongue River and Sentinel Butte Formations			6
2.	Locations of sandstone samples of Tongue River and Sentinel Butte Formations		•	15
3.	Petrographic data for sandstone samples of Tongue River and Sentinel Butte Formations		. 1	17

.

ABSTRACT

Weathered surfaces of the Tongue River Formation are more rounded and smoother than those of the overlying Sentinel Butte Formation. Small, relatively straight, steep-sided gulleys and small caves and tunnels are rare on exposures of the Tongue River and are absent on sandstone, but they are common on exposures of the Sentinel Butte, especially on sandstone.

Sandstone in the Tongue River Formation is much more friable than sandstone in the Sentinel Butte Formation. The Tongue River generally is easily excavated with a pick, but the Sentinel Butte is not.

Thick (a few tens of meters), tabular, laterally continuous sandstone beds are more common in the Sentinel Butte, and trough-shaped, laterally restricted sandstone beds are more common in the Tongue River.

Sedimentary-rock fragments are more abundant constituents of the sandstone of the Tongue River, and volcanic-rock fragments and metamorphic-rock fragments are more abundant constituents of the sandstone of the Sentinel Butte.

Zircon, tourmaline, and hornblende are the more common heavy minerals in sandstone of the Tongue River Formation, and kyanite and epidote are the more common heavy minerals in sandstone of the Sentinel Butte Formation. The zircon and tourmaline were probably derived from sedimentary rocks, and epidote and kyanite were probably derived from metamorphic rocks in the source areas.

Mica is the most abundant clay mineral in most Tongue River samples, although quartz is the most abundant mineral of the clay-size fraction of most of the samples. Montmorillonite is the most abundant mineral in the clay-size fraction of most Sentinel Butte samples, and it probably causes the color to be darker than the color of the Tongue River Formation. Calcite and dolomite are more abundant in most clay-size samples of the Tongue River than in clay-size samples of the Sentinel Butte.

Silicified wood is much more common in the Sentinel Butte than in the Tongue River. This probably resulted from the availability of soluble amorphous silica contained in volcanic-rock fragments.

INTRODUCTION

The Paleocene Tongue River and Sentinel Butte Formations either form the bedrock or occur at the surface over about 50 percent of North Dakota. Where the formations are well exposed, as in the badlands of the Little Missouri River, they can be easily differentiated. The most important difference between the two units is the color of weathered surface exposures (first pointed out by Leonard and Smith in 1909). The Tongue River Formation is yellow, buff or light gray, and the overlying Sentinel Butte Formation is darker gray or brown. In the Little Missouri River area the contact between the two formations is marked by a lignitic unit, the HT Bed, which ranges up to several meters thick. In many places the lignite is burned and the HT Bed is "scoria" (a local term for brick-red rock baked by the burning lignite). A sand bed at the base of the Sentinel Butte Formation also marks the contact. This bed ranges from a few meters to several tens of meters thick. Locally it may become so fine-grained as to lose its identity.

Where the contact is not visible it may be difficult to determine which formation is present. Although the color is probably the most obvious and easily used difference, it is largely a weathering phenomenon and is not always dependable. In the subsurface it has been difficult to distinguish these two formations, and outside the area of the Little Missouri River the contact may be difficult to recognize. The purpose of this report is to describe characteristics that can be used to differentiate the Tongue River and Sentinel Butte Formations on the outcrop or in the subsurface. These characteristics were determined from surface sections in various parts of the badlands of the Little Missouri River and other areas in the western part of the Williston Basin where both formations are well exposed and can be identified with certainty.

CRITERIA FOR DIFFERENTIATING THE TONGUE RIVER AND SENTINEL BUTTE FORMATIONS

Criteria Useful for Surface Sections Only

Weathering and Topography

The Sentinel Butte forms steeper, more irregular slopes than the Tongue River, probably because it is better cemented (figs. 1 through 4). Sandstone in the Tongue River weathers into more rounded, smoother surfaces (fig. 2). Rather straight gulleys with very steep sides are common on the Sentinel Butte, but are rare on the Tongue River, especially on sandstone (compare figs. 1 through 4). The steep-sided gulleys on the Sentinel Butte commonly are associated with small caves and tunnels, apparently formed during runoff of surface water (fig. 3). Caves or tunnels are rare on exposures of the Tongue River.

Modern drying cracks are common on the surfaces of sandstone in Sentinel Butte, but are almost completely lacking on surfaces of sandstone in the Tongue River (compare figs. 2 and 4). This may be due to the higher content of montmorillonite in the Sentinel Butte; montmorillonite swells when it absorbs water, so cracks could easily form during drying.

Criteria Useful for Surface or Subsurface Sections

Friability of Sandstone

The sandstone of the Tongue River Formations is much more friable than the sandstone of the Sentinel Butte Formation except where it is cemented as concretions. The sandstone of the Tongue River is easily excavated with a pick and completely disaggregates. The sandstone of the Sentinel Butte is much more difficult to excavate with a pick. It does not disaggregate when struck but breaks into pieces, each of which remains consolidated. The difference in friability between the two formations may be of limited usefulness in subsurface sections.

Geometry of Sandstone Beds

Detailed stratigraphic cross sections have been prepared through the Tongue River Formation near Medora (Jacob, 1973) and the Sentinel Butte Formation in and near the North Unit of Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park (Cherven, 1973; Johnson, 1973). These cross sections show that both tabular and trough-shaped sand beds, ranging from several meters to several tens of meters thick, occur in these formations. The tabular sand beds have flat bases and flat tops, and the trough-shaped sand beds have bases that are concave upward and tops that are flat. In map view the tabular sand beds are elongate and as much as a few kilometers wide. The trough-shaped sand beds are also elongate, but they are only as much as a few hundred meters wide.

Most of the sand beds of the Tongue River are trough shaped. Tabular sand beds are present but they are rare; most of them are 2 to 3 meters thick or less, and they are thinner than most of the tabular sand beds of the Sentinel Butte. In the Sentinel Butte Formation tabular sand beds are more common. The tabular sand beds are interpreted to have been deposited by high-sinuosity streams and the trough-shaped sand beds are interpreted to have been deposited by low-sinuosity streams (Cherven, 1973; Jacob, 1973; Johnson, 1973).



Figure 1. Sandstone bed in the Sentinel Butte Formation about 6 miles west of Fryburg, Billings County. Surface slopes are steeper than in the Tongue River Formation, and the surface is more irregular. Straight gulleys with very steep sides are almost never present in the Tongue River Formation. Dark colored talus slopes are well cemented purple, dark brown, and maroon concretions that have rarely been observed in the Tongue River Formation.



Figure 2. Sandstone bed in the Tongue River Formation near Medora. Surfaces are smoother and more rounded than in the Sentinel Butte Formation. Canvas bag is about 0.3 m across.



Figure 3. Small caves and tunnels associated with steep-sided gulleys on the Sentinel Butte Formation just south of Garrison Dam on the east side of the Missouri River Valley.



Figure 4. Modern drying cracks on the surface of a sandstone bed in the Sentinel Butte Formation near Medora. Note the steep-sided gulleys typical of this formation. Pen is 0.15 m long.

Light Minerals

Samples of sandstone and unlithified sand were collected from the Tongue River and Sentinel Butte Formations. Forty-five samples were collected from the Tongue River Formation and forty-eight samples were collected from the Sentinel Butte Formation at various locations in nine counties in western North Dakota and eastern Montana. The locations of the samples are shown in table 2. The samples were collected from various stratigraphic positions in both formations.

Thin sections were prepared either of sandstone or of mounted grains of uncemented sand. At least one hundred points were counted on each sandstone slide using a mechanical stage, and at least one hundred grains were counted on each slide of uncemented sand. The data were assembled and printed (table 3) by the FORTRAN program FOLKSS (available from me) to classify sandstones according to Folk's (1968) classification (fig. 5).

Figures 6 and 7 show that all sandstone samples of both formations are litharenites, according to Folk's (1968) classification. Classification of the litharenites, shown in figures 8 and 9, indicates that all sandstone samples of the Tongue River are sedimentary litharenites and many sandstone samples of the Sentinel Butte are volcanic litharenites. In other words, sedimentary-rock fragments are more abundant in the Tongue River than in the Sentinel Butte, and volcanic-rock fragments and metamorphic-rock fragments are more abundant in the Sentinel Butte than in the Tongue River. The sedimentary-rock fragments in both formations are largely finely to coarsely crystalline carbonate fragments.

So another means of distinguishing the two formations is available. If thin sections are cut, preferably of mounted grains of uncemented sand, at least 100 grains can be counted on each slide. The total number of sedimentary-rock fragments, volcanic-rock fragments, and metamorphic-rock fragments can be recalculated to 100 percent; if there are a large number of samples, this can be done using a computer program available from me. The three components are then plotted on a triangular diagram as in figures 8 and 9. If there are a large number of samples this can be done using the FORTRAN program TRI (Lumsden, 1973). A comparison of the plots with those in figures 8 and 9 should help to identify the formation. If the plots fall within those areas in which there is overlap between figures 8 and 9, there will be difficulty in identifying the formation on the basis of sandstone petrography alone.

Heavy Minerals

A comparison of the heavy minerals of the sandstone of the Tongue River and Sentinel Butte Formations was undertaken as a class project in a course in sedimentary petrology at the University of North Dakota in the spring of 1972. Table 1 presents some of the results of that study. Sample 1 is from the base of the Tongue River Formation in SE⁴/₄sec 29, T136N, R104W, Slope County. Samples 2 through 11 were collected at 6-meter vertical intervals from the Tongue River Formation in the cliff at the east side of Medora. Sample 11 is from the Medora Member about 26 m below the top of the formation. Samples 12 through 19 were collected from the Sentinel Butte Formation at various intervals successively from the base of the formation to a point 110 m above the base in Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park (North Unit) just east of Squaw Creek Campground. Sample 20 is from the sand bed at the top of the Sentinel Butte Formation on Sentinel Butte.

Two workers analyzed the samples from the Tongue River Formation and three workers analyzed the samples from the Sentinel Butte Formation. The data of table 1 are averages of the data of the workers. Before separation of the heavy minerals the original sample was sieved into the $2.0\emptyset$ to $4.0\emptyset$ size fraction. After separation, the heavy minerals were sieved into the $2.0\emptyset$ to $3.0\emptyset$, $3.0\emptyset$ to $3.5\emptyset$, and $3.5\emptyset$ to $4.0\emptyset$ size fractions and slides were prepared. One hundred grains were counted for each size fraction, excluding mica, opaque minerals, and rock fragments. In table 1 the percentages shown are averages of the three-size fractions, except for zircon, which best showed detectable differences between the two formations in the $3.5\emptyset$ to $4.0\emptyset$ size fraction.



Table 1. Some heavy-mineral analyses of the Tongue River and Sentinel Butte Formations. Samples arranged in vertical sequence. Locations of samples and sources of data explained in text. Percentages are of the heavy-mineral fraction excluding mica, opaque minerals, and rock fragments. Data for each mineral are for size fraction indicated.



Figure 5. Folk's (1968) classification of sandstones used in this report. Triangle 2 is used to subdivide litharenites and triangle 3 is used to subdivide sedimentary litharenites. Symbols explained in title of table 3.

Table 1 shows that tourmaline is more abundant in the Tongue River Formation than in the Sentinel Butte Formation, and zircon is more abundant in the lower part of the Tongue River Formation than in the rest of the section. Probably this is because sedimentary rocks were more abundant in the source area of the Tongue River Formation than in the source area of the Sentinel Butte Formation (compare figs. 8 and 9). Zircon and tourmaline are very stable and probably had been concentrated in these sedimentary rocks during one or more previous sedimentary cycles. Following erosion of these sedimentary rocks the zircon and tourmaline were redeposited in the Tongue River Formation. It is not clear why hornblende is more abundant in the Tongue River Formation than in the Sentinel Butte Formation.

Figures 8 and 9 indicate that metamorphic rocks were more abundant in the source area of the Sentinel Butte Formation than in the source area of the Tongue River Formation. Probably this is because metamorphic rocks became exposed in the source area following erosion of much of the overlying cover of sedimentary rocks during deposition of the Tongue River Formation. This probably explains why kyanite and epidote, both metamorphic minerals, are more abundant in the Sentinel Butte than in the Tongue River (table 1).

Many other heavy minerals besides those listed in table 1 were counted, but data concerning them are not presented because they show no detectable differences between the two formations.

Clay Minerals

Emmanuel and Jacob (1974) studied the clay mineralogy in 80 samples from the Tongue River and 7 samples from Sentinel Butte Formations in the area near Medora. Figures 10 and 11 show typical X-ray diffractograms of the clay-size fraction of the Tongue River and Sentinel Butte Formations.



Figure 6. Sandstones of the Tongue River Formation plotted according to triangle 1 of figure 5. Numbers indicate where more than one sample occupy a point. Figure was printed by FORTRAN program TRI (Lumsden, 1973).

In all samples of the Sentinel Butte, the montmorillonite peak at 14 to 15 Å is higher than either the mica peak at about 10 Å or the dehydrated halloysite peak at 7.1-7.2 Å (fig. 11). The montmorillonite peak in nearly all samples of the Sentinel Butte is higher than in samples of the Tongue River. The high montmorillonite content of the Sentinel Butte, which probably resulted from weathering of volcanic ash, probably is the cause of the color being darker than the color of the Tongue River.

In samples of the Tongue River Formation the mica peak at about 10 Å is higher than the montmorillonite peak at 14 to 15 Å (fig. 10). The quartz peak at 3.34 Å is the highest peak in most samples of the Tongue River, and it is much higher in the Tongue River samples than in the Sentinel Butte samples.



Figure 7. Sandstones of the Sentinel Butte Formation plotted according to triangle 1 of figure 5. Numbers indicate where more than one sample occupy a point. Figure was printed by FORTRAN program TRI (Lumsden, 1973).

The calcite peak at about 3.01 Å and the dolomite peak at 2.88 Å are quite variable. Generally they are much lower in the Sentinel Butte samples than in the Tongue River samples. This confirms Royse's (1970) observation that the Sentinel Butte Formation is less calcareous than the Tongue River Formation.

The differences in clay mineralogy between the Tongue River and Sentinel Butte can be seen at a glance on a diffractogram. If a slide of the clay-size fraction is prepared using distilled water and it is scanned from 4° 20 to 28° 20, the diffractogram can be compared with figures 10 and 11 to help identify the formation.



Figure 8. Sandstones of the Tongue River Formation plotted according to triangle 2 of figure 5. Numbers indicate where more than one sample occupy a point. Figure was printed by FORTRAN program TRI (Lumsden, 1973).

Silicified Wood

Silicified wood is much more common in the Sentinel Butte than in the Tongue River. Probably this is because volcanic-rock fragments are more abundant in the Sentinel Butte (fig. 9). One of the criteria used to identify these fragments is that they may contain glass. Glass is amorphous silica, which is more than ten times as soluble as crystalline silica at values of pH less than 9, and it is increasingly more soluble than crystalline silica at values greater than 9 (Krauskopf, 1967, fig. 6-3). So silica should have been abundant in solution in the interstitial water of the Sentinel Butte Formation throughout its history, and it should have been readily available for the silicification of wood.



Figure 9. Sandstones of the Sentinel Butte Formation plotted according to triangle 2 of figure 5. Numbers indicate where more than one sample occupy a point. Figure was printed by FORTRAN program TRI (Lumsden, 1973).



Figure 10. Typical X-ray diffractogram of the clay-size fraction of the Tongue River Formation (from Emmanuel and Jacob, 1974). Note that the mica peak at 9.97 Å is higher than the montmorillonite peak at 14.24 Å, and the quartz peak at 3.34 Å is the highest peak on the chart.



Figure 11. Typical X-ray diffractogram of the clay-size fraction of the Sentinel Butte Formation. Note that the montmorillonite peak at 14 Å is higher than the mica peak at 10 Å, and it is the highest peak on the chart. The quartz peak at 3.34 Å is lower than in the Tongue River Formation. The orthoclase peak at 3.26 Å is higher in this sample than in most others of the Sentinel Butte Formation.

SUMMARY

Weathered surfaces of the Tongue River Formation are generally buff, yellow, or light gray, and weathered surfaces of the overlying Sentinel Butte Formation are generally darker gray or brown. The darkness probably results from a greater content of montmorillonite. Sandstone in the Tongue River is much more friable than in the Sentinel Butte, and it weathers into more rounded, smoother surfaces, as do the other Tongue River lithologies. Small, rather straight gulleys with very steep sides, and small caves and tunnels are rare on exposures of the Tongue River and are absent on sandstone, but they are common on exposures of the Sentinel Butte, especially on sandstone.

Thick (a few tens of meters), tabular, laterally continuous sandstone beds are more common in the Sentinel Butte, and trough-shaped, laterally restricted sandstone beds are more common in the Tongue River. This difference is most easily used to differentiate the formations on good, large-scale exposures, but it might also be used where close control is available in the subsurface.

Sedimentary-rock fragments, consisting mostly of finely to coarsely crystalline carbonate, are more abundant constituents of the sandstone of the Tongue River, and volcanic-rock fragments and metamorphic-rock fragments are more abundant constituents of the sandstones of the Sentinel Butte. Triangular plots of rock-fragment type can be used to differentiate the two formations in both surface and subsurface sections.

Zircon, tourmaline, and hornblende are more common in the Tongue River than in the Sentinel Butte. The zircon and tourmaline were probably derived from sedimentary rocks in the source area. Kyanite and epidote, both metamorphic heavy minerals, are more abundant in the Sentinel Butte than in the Tongue River and were probably from metamorphic rocks in the source area. These differences can be used in either surface or subsurface sections, but the preparation and analysis of samples is tedious and time consuming.

X-ray diffractograms of the clay-size fraction of the Tongue River show high mica peaks at about 10 Å and high quartz peaks at 3.34 Å relative to other peaks in the samples. The clay-size fraction of the Sentinel Butte shows high montmorillonite peaks at 14 to 15 Å compared to other peaks. (The only other clay minerals that occur in either formation in recognizable quantities are dehydrated halloysite and chlorite.) The calcite peak at about 3.01 Å and the dolomite peak at 2.88 Å generally are much lower in Sentinel Butte samples. These differences can be used relatively easily to differentiate the formations in either surface or subsurface sections.

Silicified wood is much more common in the Sentinel Butte Formation than in the Tongue River Formation. This difference might be used to distinguish the formations in subsurface sections, but it probably is more easily used in surface sections.

REFERENCES

- Cherven, Victor B., 1973, High- and low-sinuosity stream deposits of the Sentinel Butte Formation (Paleocene) McKenzie County, North Dakota: Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of North Dakota, 73 p.
- Emmanuel, Richard, and Jacob, Arthur F., 1974, Mineralogy of the clay-size fraction of the Paleocene Tongue River and Sentinel Butte Formations near Medora, North Dakota: North Dakota Academy of Science, v. 28 (in preparation).
- Folk, R. L., 1968, Petrology of Sedimentary Rocks: Hemphill's Book Store, Austin, Texas, 170 p.
- Jacob, Arthur F., 1973, Depositional environments of Paleocene Tongue River Formation, western North Dakota: Am. Assoc. Petroleum Geologists Bull., v. 57, no. 6, p. 1038-1052.
- Johnson, Robert Post, 1973, Depositional environments of the upper part of the Sentinel Butte Formation, southeastern McKenzie County, North Dakota: Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of North Dakota, 63 p.
- Krauskopf, Konrad B., 1967, Introduction to geochemistry: McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 721 p.
- Leonard, A. G., and Smith, D. C., 1909, The Sentinel Butte lignite field, North Dakota and Montana: U.S. Geol. Survey Bull. 341, p. 15-35.
- Lumsden, David N., 1973, TRI: A FORTRAN subroutine to plot points on a triangular diagram: Geol. Soc. America Bull., v. 84, p. 1765-1768.
- Royse, Chester F., Jr., 1967, Tongue River-Sentinel Butte contact in western North Dakota: North Dakota Geol. Survey Rept. Inv. 45, 53 p.
- Royse, Chester F., Jr., 1970, A sedimentologic analysis of the Tongue River-Sentinel Butte interval (Paleocene) of the Williston Basin, western North Dakota: Sed. Geol., v. 4, p. 19-80.

Tongue River Formation

<u>Sample No.</u> *	Location			
	<u>Township N.</u>	<u>Range W.</u>	Section	County
101	140	102	NW ¹ ⁄ ₄ 25	Billings
102	140	102	NW¼ 25	Billings
103	140	102	NW1/4 25	Billings
104	140	102	NW1/4 25	Billings
105	140	102	NW1/4 25	Billings
112	142	102	NW1/4 12	Billings
113	143	102	SE ¹ / ₄ 14	Billings
114	143	102	SE¼ 14	Billings
115	141	101	SW1/4 5	Billings
116	141	101	SW1/4 5	Billings
121	140	102	SE ¹ / ₄ 22	Billings
122	140	102	SE ¹ / ₄ 22	Billings
123	140	102	SE ¹ /4 22	Billings
129	137	101	NW1/4 29	Billings
130	137	101	NW1/4 29	Billings
131	136	102	SE ¹ /4 25	Billings
132	136	102	SE1/4 25	Billings
133	136	104	SE ¹ /4 29	Billings
134	136	104	SE ¹ /4 29	Billings
135	136	104	SE ¹ /4 29	Billings
136	129	95	SE1/4 20	Adams
137	129	95	SE ¹ /4 20	Adams
139	130	98	NW1/4 15	Adams
140	130	98	NW1/4 15	Adams
141	130	97	SE ¹ /4 10	Adams
142	130	97	SE¼ 10	Adams
143	151	103	NW1/4 1	McKenzie
144	151	103	NW¼ 1	McKenzie
146	151	104	NE ¹ / ₄ 13	McKenzie
147	150	104	NE ¹ / ₄ 22	McKenzie
148	150	104	NE ¹ / ₄ 22	McKenzie
149	150	104	NE ¹ / ₄ 22	Dawson Co., Mt.
150	150	104	NE ¹ / ₄ 22	Dawson Co., Mt.
151	140	102	NW ¹ / ₄ 20	Billings
152	140	102	NW1/4 20	Billings
153	129	94	NW1/4 16	Adams
154	129	94	NW1/4 16	Adams
155	129	92	NW1/4 14	Adams
156	129	92	NW1/4 14	Adams
157	129	92	SW1/4 15	Adams
158	129	92	SW1/4 1.5	Adams
159	130	88	NW1/4 32	Grant

*Sample numbers refer to the samples listed in table 3.

-

Sentinel Butte Formation

<u>Sample No.</u> *	Location			
	<u>Township N.</u>	<u>Range W.</u>	Section	<u>County</u>
201	146	84	SW1/4 9	McLean
202	146	84	SW1/4 9	McLean
204	148	90	NE¼ 22	McLean
206	148	90	NE¼ 22	McLean
207	151	94	NE ¹ / ₄ 5	McKenzie
208	150	94	NE ¹ / ₄ 4	McKenzie
209	150	94	NE¼ 4	McKenzie
210	148	95	SW¼ 23	Dunn
211	144	99	SE¼ 21	Billings
216	147	99	NE¼ 13	McKenzie
217	147	99	NE¼ 13	McKenzie
220	153	101	SE¼ 20	McKenzie
221	153	101	SE¼ 20	McKenzie
222	140	101	NE¼ 33	Billings
223	134	101	NW1/4 3	Slope
225	140	101	NE¼ 33	Billings
226	139	105	NW¼ 8	Golden Valley
227	139	105	NW¼ 8	Golden Valley
228	139	105	NW1⁄4 8	Golden Valley
229	139	105	NW¼ 8	Golden Valley
230	148	99	NW¼ 32	McKenzie
231	148	99	NW1/4 32	McKenzie
232	148	99	NW1/4 32	McKenzie
233	148	99	NW1/4 32	McKenzie
234	148	99	NW¼ 32	McKenzie
235	148	99	NW¼ 32	McKenzie
236	148	99	NW1/4 32	McKenzie
237	148	99	NW1/4 32	McKenzie
241	147	99	NW¼ 32	McKenzie
242	147	99	NW1/4 32	McKenzie
243	147	99	NW1/4 32	McKenzie
244	147	99	NW1/4 32	McKenzie
246	147	99	NW1/4 32	McKenzie
248	147	99	NW¼ 32	McKenzie

*Sample numbers refer to the samples listed in table 3.

Table 3. Petrographic data for sandstone samples of Tongue River and Sentinel Butte Formations. Sample locations given in table 2. Sample numbers 204, 206, 208, 302, 305, 306, 310, 312, and 313 are of thin sections of mounted grains of uncemented sand, Sample 303 is a sandy micrite that was counted in the same way as a thin section of mounted grains of uncemented sand. All other samples are cemented sandstones.

The meanings of the symbols in the table are as follows:

0

Q	Quartz	SHR	Shale Rock Fragments
STQ	Straight Quartz	CHR	Chert Rock Fragments
SLUQ	Slightly Undulose Quartz	VR	Volcanic Rock Fragments
STUQ	Strongly Undulose Quartz	MR	Metamorphic Rock Fragments
SCQ	Semi-Composite Quartz	С	Cement
CQ	Composite Quartz	CAC	Calcite Cement
CMQ	Composite-Metamorphic Quartz	SIC	Silica Cement
F	Feldspar	FEC	Iron-oxide Cement
KF	Potassium Feldspar	OC	Other Cement
PF	Plagioclase Feldspar	М	Matrix
G	Granite Fragments	Р	Porosity
R	Rock Fragments	0	Other
CR	Carbonate Rock Fragments		

101. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL CATA Q STQ SLUQ STUQ SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF G 2. ۰. 9. 3. 21. 1. 2. 8. Ο. 0. 0. CR CHR VR MR С CAC SIC oc R SHR FEC 29. 2. 15. 12. 2. 11. 1. 0. 0. 0. 0. P M 0 26. 6. 1. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 40. PERCENT QTZ 4. PERCENT FELDSPAR 56. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT

> 89. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 4. PFRCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 7. PERCENT META RK FRAGS

THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT

> 8. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 48. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 44. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS

THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

102. SAMPLE NO. 97. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUD SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF G Q 0. ι. 0. 0. 0. з. 1 . 21. 11. 6. 1. R CR SHR CHR VR MR С CAC SIC FEC oc з. 16. 0. 0. 0. 40. 8. 2. 0. 25. 2. M P 0 0. 18. 1. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 34. PERCENT OTZ 2. PERCENT FELDSPAR 65. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 75. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 20. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 5. PFRCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 10. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 83. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 7. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE ************ 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED 103. SAMPLE NO. ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUD KF SCQ CQ CMQ F PF G Q 5. 16. 8. 0. 1. 0. 2. 0. 0. 0. 0. FEC R CR SHR CHR VR MR С CAC SIC 0C 42. 24. 7. 2. 9. 0. 14. 0. 0. 0. 0. P 0 M 0. 28. 0. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 28. PERCENT QTZ 0. PERCENT FELDSPAR 72. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 79. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 21. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 21. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 73. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 6. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

.

104. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUD sco CQ CMQ F KF PF Q G 5. CAC 9. 0. 23. 3. 0. ۰. 0. 0. 6. CHR VR SIC R CR SHR MR С FEC OC 26. 3. 18. 1. 1. 2. 0. 13. 10. 0. 0. P 0 M 0. 0. 38. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 47. PERCENT QTZ 0. PERCENT FELDSPAR 53. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 91. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 9. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CFR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 5. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 90. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 5. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED 105. SAMPLE NO. ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUD SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF G Q 5. 0. 27. 10. 9. 3. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. FEC R CR SHR CHR VR MR С CAC SIC oc 24. 0. 5. 9. 8. 0. 15. 1. 1. 0. 1. M P 0 40. 0. 0. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 53. PERCENT QTZ 0. PERCENT FELDSPAR 47. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 95. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 5. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 24. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 71. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 5. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS . THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

19

100. TOTAL 112. SAMPLE NO. POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA CMQ F KF PF STO SLUG STUD SCO CQ G G 0. 0. Ο. 20. 9. 5. 2. 0. 0. 2. 0. R CR SHR CHR VR MR С CAC SIC FEC oc 4. 2. 15. 8. 3. 3. 2. 2. 27. 13. з. M Ρ 0 29. 9. 0. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 43. PERCENT QTZ 0. PERCENT FELDSPAR 57. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT EO. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 12. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 8. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 20. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 65. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 15. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE 113. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL CATA STO SLUG STUD SCQ Q CQ CMQ F KF PF G 18. 7. 5. 2. 0. ο. 1. 0. з. 0. 0. SIC R CR SHR CHR VR MR С CAC FEC OC 38. 30. 3. 0. 17. 11. 1. 1. 4. 2. 0. M P 0 22. 5. 0. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 32. PERCENT QTZ 0. PERCENT FELDSPAR 68. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 91. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 9. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 3. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 94. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 3. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

114. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUD SCQ CMQ 0 CQ F KF PF G 4. 8. 3. 0C 18. Ο. 1. 1. 7. 0. 2. 0. R CR SHR CHR VR MR С CAC SIC FEC 25. 0. 0. 11. 0. 0. 23. 1 . 0. 1. 11. M P 0 7. 31. 4. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 38. PERCENT QTZ 9. PERCENT FELDSPAR 53. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 96. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 4. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 0. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 96. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 4. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE ********** 115. SAMPLE NO. 101. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUD SCQ CQ CMQ F DF Q KF G 3. 2. 0. 0. 2. 19. 8. 6. 0. 1. 1. SIC FEC SHR CHR VR R CR MR С CAC 0C 5. 2. 0. .8 8. 0. 28. 19. 2. 0. 0. P 0 M 39. 0. 5. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 39. PERCENT QTZ 4. PERCENT FELDSPAR 57. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 93. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 7. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 8. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 73. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 19. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED 116. SAMPLE NO. ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUD SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF G Q 1 -1. 7. з. с 0. 0. 21. 6. 2. 1. 2. CR CHR VR MR FEC R SHR CAC SIC OC 4. 31. 21. 3. 2. 1. 6. 5. 0. 1. 0. P 0 M 35. 0. 6. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 40. PERCENT QTZ 2. PERCENT FELDSPAR 58. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 90. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 6. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 3. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 14. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 75. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 11. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE 121. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUD SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF G Q 29. 10. 10. 0. 5. 1. 0. 1. 0. 3. 1. R CR SHR CHR VR MR С CAC SIC FEC OC 24. 8. 2. 6. 4. 0. 10. 3. 1. 1. 1. P M 0 4. 35. 1. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 54. PERCENT QTZ 2. PERCENT FELDSPAR 44. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 58. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 33. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 8. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 7. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 71. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 21. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

122. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STQ SLUQ STUQ Q SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF G 0. 4. 2. 0. 26. 3. 12. 4. 1. 0. ο. CHR R CR SHR VR MR С CAC SIC FEC OC 5. 26. 9. 8. 1. 2. 6. 5. 0. 0. 0. M P 0 4. 37. 0. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 48. PERCENT QTZ 4. PERCENT FELDSPAR 48. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 69. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 23. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 8. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 44. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS ! 50. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 6. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE 123. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUO STUO SCQ CMQ CQ F KF PF Q G 0. Ο. ۰. 0. 22. 2. 11. 4. 5. 0. Ο. CR CHR SIC FEC R SHR VR MR С CAC 00 35. 7. 25. 0. 1. 2. 7. 6. 1. 0. 0. P 0 M 34. ο. 2. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 39. PERCENT QTZ 0. PERCENT FELDSPAR 61. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 77. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 20. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 3. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 7. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 93. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

23

100. TOTAL 129. SAMPLE NO. PDINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL CATA STO SLUG STUD SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF G Q 2. CAC 5. C sic 1. 24. 5. 0. 0. 7. 7. 0. FEC VR R CR SHR CHR MR oc 33. 4. 5. 2. 8. 0. 20. 2. 11. 0. 3. P 0 M 21. 1. 8. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 41. PERCENT QTZ 3. PERCENT FELDSPAR 56. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 79. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 15. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 6. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 15. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 77. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 8. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE *********** 130. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUO STUD SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF Q G 9. 0. 0. 24. 7. 0. 6. 3. 1. 1. 3. SHR R CR CHR VR MR С CAC SIC FEC OC 28. 2. 3. 2. 0. 0. 19. з. 3. 1. 1. Ρ 0 M 38. 1. 3. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 44. PERCENT QTZ 5. PERCENT FELDSPAR 51. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 86. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 11. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 4. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 13. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 79. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS B. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

.

.

.....

131. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA 0 STO SLUG STUD SCO CQ CMQ F KF PF G 0. 2. 30. 6. 11 -4. ۰. 9. 2. 0. 0. CR CHR R SHR VR С MR CAC SIC FEC OC 28. 18. 6. 2. 0. 0. 18. 16. 0. 0. 2. M P 0 0. 21. 1. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 50. PERCENT QTZ 3. PERCENT FELDSPAR 47. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 100. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 23. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 69. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 8. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE ********* 132. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUD SCQ CQ CMQ Q F KF PF G 23. 2. 8. 2. 0. 6. ο. 2. 5. 2. 0. R CR SHR CHR VR MR С CAC SIC FEC OC. 4. 31. 16. 6. 2. 3. 8. 7. 0. 1. ο. P 0 M 34. ο. 2. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 41. PERCENT QTZ 4. PERCENT FELDSPAR 55. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 77. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 13. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 10. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 25. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 67. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 8. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

25

133. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STQ SLUQ STUQ SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF G Q 2. CAC 10. 0. 0. 0. 0C 21. 4. 2. 3. 1. VR 1. CHR SHR SIC FEC CR MR С R 47. 28. 4. 6. 7. 2. 7. 5. 1 . 1. 0. P O M 20. 0. 3. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 30. PERCENT QTZ 3. PERCENT FELDSPAR 67. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 81. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 15. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 4. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 11. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 74. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 16. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE ******* 134. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUD SCO CQ CMQ F KF PF G Q 0. 0. 0. 6. 0. 15. 4. 4. 0. 1 . 0. CR SHR R CHR VR MR С CAC SIC FEC OC 41. 24. 6. 5. 3. 7. 7. 0. 0. 0. 3. P M 0 29. 7. 1. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 27. PERCENT QTZ 0. PERCENT FELDSPAR 73. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 80. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 12. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 7. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 18. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 73. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 9. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

135. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUD SCQ Q ca CMQ F KF PF G 0. 8. 0. 0. °. 1. CAC sic 21. 8. 3. 0. CHR R CR SHR VR MR FEC oc 39. 4. 4. 22. 6. 3. 3. 3. 0. 0. 0. P 0 M 31. 4. 1. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 34. PERCENT QTZ 2. PERCENT FELDSPAR 64. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 82. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 10. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 8. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 13. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 69. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 19. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE 136. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL CATA Q STQ SLUG STUQ SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF G 0. 1. 1. 0. 0. 0. 16. 6. 5. 0. 3. CHR R CR SHR VR MR С CAC SIC FEC oc 39. 32. 4. 2. 0. 0. 21. 20. 0. 0. 1. P M 0 15. 5. 4. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 29. PERCENT QTZ 0. PERCENT FELDSPAR 71. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 100. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 11. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 84. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 5. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

POINTS COUNTED 100. TOTAL 137. SAMPLE NO. OFIGINAL DATA PF STO SLUG STUD SCO CQ CMQ F KF G Q 1. CAC 5. C 5. 0. 0. 0. 0. 1. 0C 23. 10. 3. SHR SIC CHR FEC R CR VR MR 3. 4. 0. 40. 29. з. 4 . 1. 4. 0. 0. P Ο M 28. 4. ο. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 36. PERCENT QTZ 2. PERCENT FELDSPAR 63. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 90. PERCENT SED RK FPAGS 2. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 7. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 8. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 81. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 11. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE 13R. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUD SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF Q G 0. 0. 0. 2. 0. 22. 10. 9. 2. 0. 0. R CR SHR CHR VR MR С CAC SIC FEC oc 25. 19. 5. 0. 0. 0. 19. 14. 2. 1. 2. M P 0 24. 6. 4. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 47. PERCENT QTZ 0. PERCENT FELDSPAR 53. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 100. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT META RK FRAGS . THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 21. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 79. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

139. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL CATA STQ SLUQ STUQ SC Q CMQ Q cq F KF PF G. 0. 0. 14. Ο. 2. C 0. ۴. 4. 2. 0. 0. R CR SHR CHR VR MR CAC SIC FEC OC 23. 2. 2. 0. 8. 7. 0. 0. 16. 3. 1. Ρ M 0 7. 46. 2. G + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 38. PERCENT QTZ 0. PERCENT FELDSPAR 62. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 91. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 9. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 14. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS76. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS10. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE ******** 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED 140. SAMPLE NO. DRIGINAL CATA STO SLUG STUD SCQ F PF 0 CQ CMQ KF G 0. 2.5 . 0. 0. 9. 7. 5. 0. 1. 3. 0. VR DC CHR CAC FEC SHR MR C SIC -R-CR 28. 2. 3. 4. 2. 7. 6. 1. 0. 17. 0. M Ρ 0 з. 35. 2. . Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 47. PERCENT QTZ C. PERCENT FELDSPAR 53. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 79. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 14. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 7. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 9. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 77. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 14. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

.

29

.

100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED 141. SAMPLE NO. ORIGINAL CATA SCQ CMO F PF STO SLUQ STUQ CQ KF G G 2. CAC 20. 8. 2. 1. c 1 . Ο. 9. 0. 0. 1. R CR SHR CHR VR MR SIC FEC DC 47. 7. 23. 0. 0. 0. 26. 3. 10. 23. 1. D 0 M 2. 5. 1. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 29. PFRCENT OTZ 3. PERCENT FELDSPAR 68. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 77. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 21. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 2. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 19. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 72. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 8. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE ********* 142. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA ca STQ SLUQ STUQ SCQ CMQ F PF KF G Q 4. ۰. з. Ο. 0. 25. 13. 3. 2. Ο. 0. CR VR MR С CAC FEC 0C SHR CHR SIC R 44. 24. 7. 10. 2. 1. 19. 19. 0. 0. 0. P 0 M 10. 0. 2. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 36. PERCENT QTZ 0. PERCENT FELDSPAR 64. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 93. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 5. PERCENT VOLCANIC_RK_FRAGS 2. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 17. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 59. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 24. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED 143. SAMPLE NO. ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUD SC Q CQ CMQ F PF Q KF G 5. 2. CAC 0. 0. 0. 23. 4. 2. 1. 12. 1. FFC CHR VR MR С SIC OC R CR SHR 19. 4. 7. 6. 2. 0. 3. 0. 0. 0. 0. P M 0 39. 10. 4. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 52. PERCENT QTZ 5. PERCENT FELDSPAR 43. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 89. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 11. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 35. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 41. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 24. PFRCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE ******************* 144. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STQ SLUQ STUQ SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF Q G 17. 6. 0. 3. з. 1. 1. 1. 6. 2. 0. R CR SHR CHR VR MR С CAC SIC FEC nc 37. 30. 0. 4. з. ۰. 7. 5. 0. 2. 0. M P 0 5. 31. 0. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 30. PERCENT QTZ 5. PERCENT FELDSPAR 65. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 92. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 8. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 0. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 88. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 12. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

146. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUD смо SCO ca F KF PF G Q Ο. 4. 0. 2. 0. C. 2. 0. 0. 13. 5. CHR VR Ċ CAC FEC OC R CR SHR MR SIC 0. 21. 38. 29. 3. 4. 2. с. 21. Ο. 0. Ρ D M 24. 0. 4. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 25. PERCENT QTZ 0. PERCENT FELDSPAR 75. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 95. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 5. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 8. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 81. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 11. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE *********** 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED 147. SAMPLE NO. ORIGINAL CATA CMQ F KF PF STO SLUG STUG SCO CQ G Q 6. . 5. 3. 0. 0. 4. 2. 2. 0. 0. 18. SIC CAC FEC OC SHR CHR VR MR С R CR 0. 2. з. 3. 0. 0. 39. 7. 8. 6. 16. M P 0 24. 13. 1. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 31. PERCENT QTZ 3. PERCENT FELDSPAR 66. PFRCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 79. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 15. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 5. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 23. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 52. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 26. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

148. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUG SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF Q G 2. ۰0 Ο. 1 . 18. 8. 8. 1. 0. 1. 1. R CR SHR CHR VR MR С CAC SIC FEC OC 1. 45. 33. 4. з. 2. 7. 0. 0. 0. 1 . M P Ο 25. 7. 0. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 28. PERCENT QTZ 3. PERCENT FELDSPAR 69. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 84. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 16. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 3. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 87. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 11. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE 149. SAMPLE ND. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STQ SLUQ STUQ SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF Ģ Q 24. 12. 1. 0. 2. 1. 1. 0. 0. 1. 8. VR MR С CAC SIC FEC 0C R CR SHR CHR 2. 28. 18. 5. 1. 4. 0. 1 . 0. 1. 0. P M 0 4. 2. 39. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 45. PERCENT QTZ 2. PERCENT FELDSPAR 53. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 86. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 14. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 21. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 75. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 4. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED 150. SAMPLE NO. ORIGINAL CATA STQ SLUQ STUQ SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF Q G 0. 18. 14. 0. 0. 1. L. CAC 0. 3. 0. 1. FEC CR SHR CHR VR С R MR SIC 17. 37. 32. 1 . 2. 2. 0. 16. 0. 1. с. P 0 M 26. 1. 0. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 32. PERCENT QTZ 2. PERCENT FELDSPAR 66. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 95. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 5. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 3. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 91. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 6. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE ******** 151. SAMPLE NO. 101. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STQ SLUQ STUQ SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF Q G 2. 0. 0. 19. 7. 3. 3. 0. 6. 1. 1. SHR CHR CAC SIC R CR VR MR С FEC DC 41. 28. 2. 2. 3. 5. 5. 0. 0. 0. 6. P M 0 29. 1. 4. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 31. PERCENT QTZ 3. PERCENT FELDSPAR 66. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 78. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 15. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 7. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 6. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 88. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 6. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

125. TOTAL 152. SAMPLE NO. POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUO STUO SCQ ca CMQ F PF Q KF G 30. 10. 0. ٥. 7. 7. 1. 0. 1. 3. з. CHR CAC R CR SHR VR MR С SIC FEC ОC 31. 17. 2. 4. 7. 1. 3. 0. 0. 3. 0. P 0 M 29. 23. 8. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 48. PERCENT QTZ 2. PERCENT FELDSPAR 50. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 74. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 23. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 3. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 9. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 74. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 17. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE ******** 153. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL CATA CMQ F STQ SLUQ STUQ SCQ CQ KF PF G Q 19. 4. 10. 1 . 0. 0. 4. 4. 1. 1. 2. CHR VR SIC oc R CR SHR MR С CAC FEC 0. 28. 10. 3. 0. 0. 8. 7. 1. 0. 0. P Ο M 24. 18. €. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 37. PERCENT QTZ 8. PERCENT FELDSPAR 55. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 54. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 36. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 11. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 53. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 47. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SHALE LITHARENITE

100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED 154. SAMPLE NO. ORIGINAL CATA 0 STO SLUG STUD SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF G 6. 6. 20. 2. 9. 0. 0. 4. 1. 1. nc 3. SHR CHR FEC VR С CAC R CR MR SIC 32. 25. 11. з. 4. 6. 1. 30. 1. 1. 0. Ρ M 0 7. 5. 5. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 39. PERCENT QTZ 12. PERCENT FELDSPAR 49. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 72. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 24. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 4. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 17. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 61. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 22. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE * *************** 155. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL CATA STO SLUG STUD SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF Q G 0. 0. 0. 0. 7. 12. 0. 2. Ο. 21. 0. R CR SHR CHR VR MR С CAC SIC FEC OC 18. 8. 0. 7. 3. 0. 41. 39. 0. 1 . 1 . P M 0 17. 1. 2. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 54. PERCENT QTZ 0. PERCENT FELDSPAR 46. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 83. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 17. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CFR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 0. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 53. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 47. PFRCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

156. SAMPLE NO. 80. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUD Q SCQ CQ CMQ KF F PF G 19. CAC 2. FEC 3. 3. sic 1. 0C 6. 5. Ο. 1. 4. R CR SHR CHR VR MR Ċ 27. 8. 2. 2. 14. 1. 0. 17. 1. 16. 21. P M 0 7. 4. 0. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 37. PERCENT QTZ 12. PERCENT FELDSPAR 52. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 44. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 52. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 4. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A VOLCANIC LITHARENITE *********** 157. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STQ SLUQ STUQ SCQ CQ CMQ F Q KF PF G 9. 0. 26. 9. 5. 2. 0. 4. 0. ۰. 0. CR SHR CHR VR MR R С CAC SIC FEC OC 27. 0. 0. 20. 1. 6. 24. 23. 0. 0. 1. M P 0 18. 2. 3. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 49. PERCENT QTZ 0. PERCENT FELDSPAR 51. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 78. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 22. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 5. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 95. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

158. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED DRIGINAL CATA CMQ PF STQ SLUQ STUQ SCQ CQ F KF G Q 0. 0. 9. 0. 0. 2. 26. з. 10. 2. ۰. R CR SHR CHR VR MR C CAC SIC FEC OC 15. 2. 0. 9. 2. 2. 4. 28. 10. 1. 12. M Ρ 0 16. 10. 5. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 48. PERCENT QTZ 0. PERCENT FELDSPAR 52. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 57. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 30. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 7. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 13. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 75. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 13. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE ************* 159. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL CATA STO SLUG STUD SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF 0 G 0. 3. 5. 2. 17. 8. 0. 0. 5. 1. 3. CR SHR CHR VR MR С R CAC SIC FEC OC 37. 14. з. з. 15. 2. 11. 11. 0. 0. 0. P 0 M 28. 0. 2. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 29. PERCENT QTZ 8. PERCENT FELDSPAR 63. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE ÷ SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 54. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 41. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 5. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 15. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 70. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 15. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

.

.

201. SAMPLE NO. 140. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUD SCO CO CMQ F KF PF Q G 2. VR 7. 4. 127 27. 3. 10. 5. 0. 2. 0. 5. R CR SHR CHR MR С CAC SIC FEC ΟC 36. з. 4. 4. 25. 0. 8. 0. 0. 7. 1 . P 0 M 37. 21. 7. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 40. PERCENT QTZ 6. PERCENT FELDSPAR 54. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 31. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 69. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A VOLCANIC LITHARENITE 202 SAMPLE NO. 98. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL CATA SCQ F KF PF STO SLUG STUD CQ CMQ G Q 3. CAC 10. 1. 2. 0. 5. 0. 28. 3. 12. 1. VR Ċ 0C CHR MR SIC FEC CR SHR R 38. 7. 5. 5. 2. 0. 4. 0. 0. 2. 2. P M D 0. 14. 11. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 41. PERCENT OTZ 4. PERCENT FELDSPAR 55. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 89. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 11. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 29. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 41. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 29. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

80. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED 204. SAMPLE NO. ORIGINAL DATA PF STQ SLUG STUD SCQ CQ CMQ F KF G Q 12. 2. FEC 5. 13. 6. sic 4. 9. 0. 34. 3. 4. VR oc С R CR SHR CHR MR CAC 3. 2. 30. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 31. 0. 16. P 0 M 0. 0. 3. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 44. PERCENT QTZ 16. PERCENT FELDSPAR 40. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A FELDSPATHIC LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 10. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 59. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 31. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A VOLCANIC LITHARENITE 206. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUQ STUD SCQ CQ CMQ F PF KF Q G 6. 2. 2. • 37. з. 9. 4. 0. 20. 2. 1. VR FEC CR SHR MR С R CHR CAC SIC oc 54. 0. 4. 8. 29. 13. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. P 0 M 0. Ο. 3. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 38. PERCENT QTZ 6. PERCENT FELDSPAR 56. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 22. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 54. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 24. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A VOLCANIC LITHARENITE

.

.

207. SAMPLE NO. 130. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUD SCQ Q CQ CMO F KF PF G 2. CAC 27. з. 5. 1. 7. c 0. ο. 11. 0. 5. CHR VR R CR SHR MR SIC OC FEC 40. 13. 4. 2. 21. 0. 3. 0. 0. 0. 3. M ₽ 0 34. 16. 8. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 39. PERCENT QTZ 3. PERCENT FELDSPAR 58. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SP + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 47. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 52. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS Q. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A VOLCANIC LITHARENITE 208. SAMPLE NO. 97. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STQ SLUQ STUQ SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF G Q 0. 10. 0. Ο. Ο. 0. 37. 11. 11. 2. 3. R CR SHR CHR VR MR С CAC SIC FEC ΰC 5. 0. 56. 3. 25. 0. 0. 0. 0. 17. 6. М P 0 ο. 0. 4. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 40. PERCENT QTZ 0. PERCENT FELDSPAR 60. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 45. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 45. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 11. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A VOLCANIC LITHARENITE

150. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED 209. SAMPLE NO. ORIGINAL CATA CMQ STO SLUO STUD F PF SCO ca KF G 0 2. 0. 0. 0. 0. 0. 23. 11. 10. 0. 0. C CAC SIC FEC DC CHR VR MR R CR SHR 49. 49. 0. 0. 13. 2. 0. 0. 35. 19. 1. P 0 M 16. 24. 3. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 40. PERCENT QTZ 0. PERCENT FELDSPAR 60. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 57. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 37. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 6. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 5. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 95. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE ******* 210. SAMPLE NO. 125. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUO STUQ SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF G Q 9. 0. 4. 4. 5. ο. 20. 6. 6. 3. 1. CHR R CR SHR VR MR С CAC SIC FEC OC 33. 3. 2. 5. 16. 7. 43. 39. 0. 3. 1. M Р 0 14. 3. 3. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 32. PERCENT OTZ 15. PERCENT FELDSPAR 53. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 30. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 48. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 21. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A VOLCANIC LITHARENITE

211. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL CATA STO SLUG STUD SCQ CQ Q CMQ F KF PF G 7. CAC 26. 0. 4. 2. sic 2. FEC 3. 00 з. 14. 3. 2. CHR R CR SHR VR MR C 22. 1. 3. 1. 17. 0. 2. 0. 0. 1. 1. P M 0 23. 18. 2. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 47. PERCENT QTZ 13. PERCENT FELDSPAR 40. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A FELDSPATHIC LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 23. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 77. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A VOLCANIC LITHARENITE * ********* 119. TOTAL 216. SAMPLE ND. POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUD SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF G Q 20. 1. 19. 4. 0. 0. 10. 0. 10. 0. з. CHR CAC FEC пc R CR SHR VR MR С SIC 5. 5. 0. 0. 28. 1. 1. 16. 1 . 0. 1. P 0 M 23. 26. 2. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 28. PERCENT OTZ 30. PERCENT FELDSPAR 42. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A FELDSPATHIC LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 25. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 57. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 18. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A VOLCANIC LITHARENITE

POINTS COUNTED 141. TOTAL 217. SAMPLE NJ. ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUD SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF Q G 2. 0C 4. 4. 1. 17. 1 . 5. 3. 1. з. 1. R CR SHR CHR VR MR С CAC SIC FEC 59. 0. 0. 61. 1 . 24. 7. 2. 8. 7. 1. P 0 M 27. 2. 6. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 38. PERCENT QT7 9. PERCENT FELDSPAR 53. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 38. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 33. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 29. PERCENT META PK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 0. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 78. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 22. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE ************ 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED 220. SAMPLE NO. ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUG SCQ CQ CMO F KF DF 0 G 0. 18. 10. 4. 0. 3. 0. 0. 0. 1. 0. VR CHR С CAC SIC FEC R SHR MR CR OC 36. 2. 1. 8. 22. 3. 5. 0. 1. 2. 2. P M 0 27. 9. 5. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 33. PERCENT OTZ 0. PFRCENT FELDSPAR 67. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 31. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 61. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 8. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A VOLCANIC LITHARENITE

221. SAMPLE NO. 101. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STQ SLUQ STUQ Q SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF G 15. sic 5. CAC 1. 0. ۰. з. 0. 6. 1. CR CHR VR C R SHR MR FEC 0C 19. 2. 7. 1. 8. 1. 30. 29. 1. 0. 0. P 0 Μ 33. 0. 3. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 43. PERCENT QTZ 3. PERCENT FELDSPAR 54. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 53. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 42. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 5. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 10. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 70. PFRCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 20. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE ******** POINTS COUNTED 222. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL ORIGINAL CATA STO SLUG STUD SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF Q G 10. 5. 0. 0. o. oc 2. 0. 1. 0. 1. 1. VR FEC R CR SHR CHR MR С CAC SIC 21. 8. 2. 2. 9. 0. 34. 34. 0. 0. 0. P 0 M 32. 3. 0. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 32. PERCENT QTZ 0. PERCENT FELDSPAR 68. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 57. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 43. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 17. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 67. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 17. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

45

100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED 223. SAMPLE NO. DRIGINAL CATA PF F KF STO SLUG STUD SCQ СQ CMQ G Q 0. 14. 5. 0. 6. С. 0. 0. 0. 1. 2. MR CAC SIC FEC 00 VR С CR CHR R SHR 34. 28. 14. 0. 4. 8. 2. 33. 1. 0. 0. P M Ο 20. 2. 2. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 33. PERCENT QTZ 0. PERCENT FELDSPAR 67. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 64. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 29. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 7. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 0. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 78. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 22. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE **** 225. SAMPLE NO. 10C. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUO STUO SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF G 0 0. ۰. 21. 5. 10. 3. 1. 1. 1. 1. 0. CR SHR CHR VR MR CAC SIC FEC ΟC R 35. 4. 5. 4. 16. 1. 2. 12. 1. 0. 0. P 0 M 23. 3. 12. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 37. PERCENT QTZ 2. PERCENT FELDSPAR 61. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 54. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 34. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 11. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 5. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 84. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 11. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

46

226. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL CATA STO SLUG STUD Q SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF G 26. 5. 9. 2. VR 3. 3. UC 1. FEC 2. 5. 6. 2. R CR SHR CHR MR С CAC SIC 31. 0. 4. 26. 1. 0. 2. 0. ο. 0. 2. P M 0 22. 12. 1. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 41. PERCENT QTZ 10. PERCENT FELDSPAR 49. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 16. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 84. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A VOLCANIC LITHARENITE ******** 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED 227. SAMPLE NO. ORIGINAL CATA STO SLUG STUG SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF Q G 15. 0. 5. 6. 0. Ο. 1. 3. 1. 0. 1. R CR SHR CHR VR MR CAC SIC FEC oc С 44. 9. 0. 4. 30. 2. 0. Ο. 1. 0. 2. M P 0 24. 11. 3. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 25. PERCÉNT OTZ 2. PERCENT FELDSPAR 73. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 11. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 68. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 20. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A VOLCANIC LITHARENITE

100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED 228. SAMPLE NO. ORIGINAL DATA CMQ PF SCQ CQ F KF G STO SLUQ STUO Q 2. 4 • C 0. 1. 8. 1. 5. 3. 2. 2. 24. VR MR CAC SIC FEC CHR CR SHR R Ο. 0. 0. 0. 34. 0. 2. 5. 24. 3. 0. M Ρ 0 12. 25. 3. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 40. PERCENT QTZ 3. PFRCENT FELDSPAR 57. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 21. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 71. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 9. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A VOLCANIC LITHARENITE ******* 229. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUD SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF G Q 0. 0. 0. 3. C 0. 0. 9. Ο. 17. 2. з. R CR SHR CHR VR MR CAC SIC FEC oc 32. 4. 0. 0. 39. 0. 2. 1 . 1. 0. 1. M P 0 37. 5. 1. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 30. PERCENT QTZ 0. PERCENT FELDSPAR 70. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 8. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 82. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 10. PERCENT META RK FRAGS . THIS SAMPLE IS A VOLCANIC LITHARENITE

.

230. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUD SCQ CQ CMQ F Q KF PF G 23. з. 7. CAC з. 5. 1. 4. 0. 1. 0. R CR SHR CHR VR MR С SIC FEC OC 4. 4. 24. 0. 1. 15. 35. 37. 1. 1. 0. М Ρ 0 13. 2. 0. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 48. PERCENT QTZ 2. PERCENT FELDSPAR 50. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 33. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 63. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 4. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A VOLCANIC LITHARENITE 231. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STQ SLUQ STUQ SCQ CQ CMQ KF PF F G Q 3. 0. 0. 0. 5. 0. 1. 1. 17. 6. 3. VR CAC CHR SIC FEC R CR SHR MR С OC 27. 7. 39. 4. 4. 10. 2. 40. 0. 0. 1 . M P 0 8. 0. 7. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 38. PERCENT GTZ 2. PERCENT FELDSPAR 60. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 56. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 37. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 7. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 27. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 27. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 47. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CHERT LITHARENITE

121. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED 232. SAMPLE NO. ORIGINAL DATA CQ CMQ KF PF G STQ SLUQ STUQ SCQ F Q 0. ο. 0. ۰0 0. 24. 10. 12. 1. 1. 0. SHR VR CAC SIC FEC 0C CHR MR С R CR 53. 52. 0. 1. 0. 15. 5. 2. 1. з. 1. P 0 M 7. . 8 14. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 62. PERCENT QTZ 0. PERCENT FELDSPAR 38. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 67. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 25. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 8. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 25. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 63. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 13. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE 233. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL CATA STO SLUQ STUD SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF Q G 26. 11. 9. 0. 2. 2. 2. 1. 0. 1. 0. R CR SHR CHR VR MR CAC FEC С SIC oc 0. 0. 4. 0. 21. 12. 5. 41. 41. 0. 0. P M D 9. 0. 2. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 54. PERCENT QTZ 2. PERCENT FELDSPAR 44. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 57. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 24. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 19. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 0. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 100. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 0. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

234. SAMPLE NO. 101. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUD SCQ CQ CMQ Q F KF PF G CAC 27. 0. 2. 10. 7. 1. 1 . 6. 2. 1. SIC CHR VR С R CR SHR MR FEC oc 7. 31. .8 1. 8. 7. 1. 0. 0. 0. 1. P 0 M 25. 11. 3. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 44. PERCENT QTZ 5. PERCENT FELDSPAR 51. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 52. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 26. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 23. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 44. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 50. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 6. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE ************* 235. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA SCQ F PF STQ SLUQ STUQ CQ CMQ G KF G 9. 0. 0. 31. 4. 14. 1 . 0. 3. 0. 0. VR CR SHR CHR MR С CAC R SIC FEC **0**C 15. 5. 10. 2. 4. 1. 1. 4. 6. 0. 2. P M 0 21. 22. 1. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 67. PERCENT QTZ 0. PERCENT FELDSPAR 33. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 40. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 33. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 27. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 17. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 67. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 17. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

51

10C. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED 236. SAMPLE NO. ORIGINAL DATA F KF DF STA SLUG STUD SCQ CO CMQ G Q 2. C 1. 19. ۶. 0. 1. 0. 0. 6. 2. 1. CHR DC CR VR MR CAC SIC FEC SHR R 6. 10. 2. 0. 0. 2. 41. 38. 2. 1. 0. P 0 M 17. 11. 1. 0 + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 63. PERCENT QTZ 3. PERCENT FELDSPAR 33. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 20. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 60. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 20. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A VOLCANIC LITHARENITE 237. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STQ SLUQ STUQ SCQ CQ CMQ F PF Q KF G 9. 25. 0. 11. č з. 2. 0. 1. 1. 3. 1. R CR SHR CHR VR MR CAC SIC FEC nc 40. 4. 4. 9. 7. 2. 0. 0. 16. 1. 1. Μ P 0 7. 21. 2. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 37. PERCENT QTZ 4. PERCENT FELDSPAR 59. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 42. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 40. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 17. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 24. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 53. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 24. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS . THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

241. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA Q STO SLUG STUD SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF G 4. 4. 4. 0. 4. 11. 1. 1. 1. 0. 0. R CR SHR CHR VR MR Ç CAC SIC FEC DC 30. 13. 10. 20. 3. 1. 3. 19. 0. 0. 1. P м 0 32. 0. 3. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 24. PERCENT QTZ 9. PERCENT FELDSPAR 67. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 57. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 33. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 10. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 18. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 76. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 6. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE. 101. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED 242. SAMPLE NO. ORIGINAL CATA STO SLUQ STUQ CQ CMQ F KF PF Q SCQ G 18. 4. 3. 0. 5. 2. 1. 6. 3. 1 . 1. VR R CR SHR CHR MR С CAC SIC FEC OC 10. 25. 9. 1. з. 16. 13. 2. 0. 2. 1. P 0 M 2. 35. 1. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 38. PERCENT QTZ 9. PERCENT FELDSPAR 53. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 48. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 40. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 12. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A SEDIMENTARY LITHARENITE SHR + CR + CHR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 17. PERCENT SHALE RK FRAGS 75. PERCENT CARBONATE RK FRAGS 8. PERCENT CHERT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A CARBONATE LITHARENITE

53

100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED 243. SAMPLE NO. ORIGINAL CATA PF SC Q CQ CMQ F KF G STO SLUG STUD Q CAC 0. 0. 1. 0C Ο. 10. 32. 4. 11. з. 4. FEC VR С SIC R CR SHR CHR MR 2. 10. 2. 6. 2. 3. 2. 17. 3. 0. 27. M P 0 4. 11. 15. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 53. PERCENT QTZ 2. PERCENT FELDSPAR 45. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 26. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 63. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 11. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A VOLCANIC LITHARENITE ********** 244. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUD SCQ CQ CMQ F KF PF Q G 6. C 33. 4. 12. 8. 3. 0. 3. 1. 1. 1 . CHR VR CAC DC R CR SHR MR SIC FEC 27. 5. 0. 6. 4. 1. 11. 0. 0. 0. 0. Ρ M 0 10. 19. 8. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 52. PERCENT QTZ 5. PERCENT FELDSPAR 43. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 41. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 41. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 19. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A VOLCANIC LITHARENITE

.

246. SAMPLE NO. 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED ORIGINAL CATA STO SLUQ STUQ SCQ Q ca CMQ F KF PF G 16. 4. CAC 2. SIC 1. 0C 3. 2. 8. ς. 1 . 0. 1. R CR SHR CHR VR MR Ċ FEC 18. 5. 2. 1. 8. 2. 19. 19. 0. 0. 0. M P 0 41. 0. 2. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 42. PERCENT QTZ 11. PERCENT FELDSPAR 47. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 44. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 44. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 11. PERCENT META RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A VOLCANIC LITHARENITE 100. TOTAL POINTS COUNTED 248. SAMPLE NO. DRIGINAL DATA STO SLUG STUD SCQ F KF PF CQ CMQ G Q 9. 3. 0. 3. 31. 11. 6. 3. 1. 0. 1. R CR SHR CHR VR MR С CAC SIC FEC OC 29. 2. 17. 8. 3. 0. 0. C. 2. 0. 3. M P 0 4. 4. 26. Q + F + R RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 49. PERCENT QTZ 5. PERCENT FELDSPAR 46. PERCENT RK FRAGS THIS SAMPLE IS A LITHARENITE SR + VR + MR RECALCULATED TO 100 PERCENT 14. PERCENT SED RK FRAGS 59. PERCENT VOLCANIC RK FRAGS 28. PERCENT META RK FRAGS

THIS SAMPLE IS A VOLCANIC LITHARENITE

. . .