### **UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

### **U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY**

Supplemental analytical results and sample locality map of stream-sediment and heavy-mineral-concentrate samples from **the Craig** Study **Area;** Craig, Dixon Entrance, Ketchikan, and Prince Rupert quadrangles, Alaska

BY

D.E. Detra, J.M. **Motooka,** and **J.B.** Cathrall

Open-File Report 92-552

This report is preliminary and **has** not **been reviewed** for conformity with U.S. Geological Survey editorial standards and stratigraphic nomenclature. Any use of **trade** names is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the **USGS.** 

*<sup>t</sup>*U.S. Geological Survey, DFC, Box 25046, MS **973,** Denver, CO 80225

# **CONTENTS**

**Page** 

- --



# **<sup>l</sup>LLUSTRAT l ONS**



# **TABLES**



### **STUDIES RELATED TO AMRAP**

The **U.S.** Geological Survey, is required by the Alaskan National Interests Lands Conservation Act (Public Law 96-487, 1980), to survey certain Federal lands to determine their mineral resource potential. Results fran the Alaskan Mineral Resource Appraisal Program **(AMRAP)** must be made available to the public and **be** sutmitted to the President and Congress. This report presents analytical results of a geochemical survey of the Craig, Dixon Entrance, and a small part of the Ketchikan, and Prince Rupert quadrangles, Alaska.

### **INTRODUCTION**

In the summer of 1991 the U.S. Geological Survey conducted supplemental reconnaissance geochmical survey of the Craig Study Area, Alaska. This report presents **data** fran the analysis of samples collected during this survey and supplements U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 91-36A (McDanal and others 1991) **where** a preponderance of the data generated frm the original reconnaissance geochemical survey is presented. The Craig Study Area carprises about 1400 mi<sup>2</sup> (3600 km<sup>2</sup>) in southeastern Alaska, and includes all of Craig, Dixon Entrance, and a small part of the western fringes of the Ketchikan and Prince Rupert 1:250,000 scale quadrangles (see fig. 1). Acccess to the study area is limited to the use of boats and flost planes. The larger settlements **are** Craig, Klawak, Hollis, and Hydaburg with Ketchikan, to the east, the nearest distributiion center for the studay area.

A digital Lotus Base format of the data which **is** presented can **be** found on floppy disk in the pocket of this report, **U.S.** Geological Survey Open-File Report 92-XXX.

The Craig Study Area contains parts of three northwest-trending tectonostratigraphic terranes **(Berg** and others, 1972, 1978; Monger and **Berg,**  1987). From the southwest to the northeast, they are the Alexander terrane, the Gravina-Nutzotin overlap assemblage, and the controversial Taku terrane (Brew and Ford, 1984). The climate of the region is mild with an average annual rainfall of 100-160 inches, a mean daily terrperature of **60-64'F** in July and **28-32°F** in January.

The **Craig** Study Area includes parts of the (frcm west to east) Prince of Wales Mountains, Kupreanof Lowlands, and Coastal Foothills (physiographic divisions of Wahrhaftig, 1965). The Prince of Wales Mauntains physiographic division consists of moderately rugged glaciated mountains with a maximum elevation of 3,800 ft. They are disected by steep-walled U-shaped valleys and **by** fiords 600-1,000 ft deep. The Kupreanof Lowlands physiographic division consists of islands and channels with a local relief of 300-500 ft and a **maximun** elevation of 1,500 ft. The coastal Foothills physiographic division consists of high mountains 3-30 mi across **separated** by flat flwt valleys and straits  $1/2 - 10$  mi wide; with a maximum elevation of 4,500 ft.



Figure 1. Location **map** of the **Craig Study Area, Alaska** 

 $\bar{\beta}$ 

### **METHODS OF STUDY**

### **Sample** Media

Analyses of the stream-sediment and heavy-mineral-concentrate samples represent the chemistry of the rock material eroded frm the drainage **basin**  upstream from each sample site. Such information is useful in identifying those basins which contain concentrations of elements that may be related to mineral deposits . Heavy-mineral -concentrate **samp** 1 **es** provide information about the chemistry of certain minerals in rock material eroded fran the drainage basin upstream **frcm** each sample site. The selective concentration of minerals, many of which **may** be ore related, permits determination of **sane**  elements that are not easily detected in stream-sediment sanples.

## Sample Collection

Forty six heavy-mineral-concentrate and 51 stream-sediment samples were collected (plate **1).** Plate 1 shows the localities where samples were collected for this supplemental study, in addition to the localities of samples collected for the original study as presented by McDanal and others, 1991.

### Stream-sediment samples

The stream-sediment samples consisted of active alluvim collected primarily from first-order (unbranched) and second-order (below the junction of two first-order) streams as shown on **USGS** topographic **maps** (scale =  $1:250,000$  (plate 1). Each sample was composited from several localities within an **area** that **may** extend as much as 20 ft from the site plotted on the **map** 

### Heavy-mineral-concentrate samples

Heavy-mineral-concentrate samples were collected fran the **same** active alluvim as **some** of the stream-sediment **sarnples.** Each bulk sample **was**  screened with a 2.0-mn (10-mesh) screen **to** remove the coarse material. The less than 2.0-mm fraction was panned until most of the quartz, feldspar, organic material, and clay-sized material were removed.

### Sample **Preparation**

The stream-sediment samples **were** air dried, then sieved using **80-mesh**  (0.17-mn) stainless-steel sieves, The portion of the sediment passing through the sieve was saved for analysis.

Samples that had been panned in the field were air dried and sieved to -35 mesh; brompform (specific gravity 2.85) was used to remove the remaining quartz and feldspar. The resultant heavy-mineral **sarrple** was separated into three fractions using a large electromagnet (in this case a modified Frantz Isodynamic Separator). The most magnetic material (removed at a setting of 0.25 **ampere),** primarily magnetite, was not analyzed. The second fraction (removed at a setting of 1.75 ampere), largely ferrmgnesian silicates and

iron oxides, was saved for archival storage. The third fraction (the nonmagnetic material which may include the normagnetic ore minerals, zircon, sphene, etc,) **was** split using a Jones splitter. One split was hand ground for spectrographic analysis; the other split was saved for mineralogical analysis. (These magnetic separates are the same separates that would be produced by using a Frantz lsodynamic Separator set at a slope of 15' and a tilt of 10' with a current of 0.2 ampere to remove the magnetite and ilmenite, and a current of 0.6 ampere to split the remainder of the sample into paramagnetic and normagnetic fractions.)

### **Sanple Analysis**

### **Spectrographic method**

The stream-sediment samples were analyzed for 35 elements and the heavymineral-concentrate samples were analyzed for 37 elements using a semiquantitative, direct-current arc mission spectrographic method (modification of **Grimes** and Marranzino, 1968). The elements analyzed and their lower limits of determination are listed in table 1.

Spectrographic results **were** obtained by visual cwnparison of spectra derived from the sample against spectra obtained from standards made from pure oxides and carbonates. Standard concentrations are geanetrically spaced over any given order of magnitude of concentration as follows: 100, 50, 20, 10, and so forth. Samples whose concentrations are estimated to fall between those values are assigned values of 70, 30, 15, and so forth. The precision of the analytical method is approximately plus or minus one reporting interval at the 83 percent confidence level and plus or minus two reporting intervals at the 96 percent confidence level (Motooka and Grimes, 1976). Values determined for the major elements, iron, magnesium, calcium, and titanium, are given in weight percent; all others **are** given in parts per million (micrograms/gram). Analytical data for samples from the Craig Study Area are listed in tables 3, and 4.

### **Chemical &hods**

Other methods of analysis used on samples from the Craig Study Area are summarized in table 2.

Analytical results for stream-sediment and heavy-mineral-concentrate samples are listed in tables 3 **and** 4 respectively.

### **DATA STORAGE SYSTEM**

Upon canpletion of all analytical work, the analytical results were entered into the Branch of Geochemistry computer data base called PLUTO. This data base contains both descriptive geological information and analytical data. Any or all of this information may be retrieved and converted to a binary form (STATPAC) for computerized statistical analysis or publication (VanTrmp and Miesch, 1977).

### **DESCRIPTION OF DATA TABLES**

Tables 3 and 4 list the results of analyses for the samples of stream sediment and heavy-mineral concentrate, respectively. For the two tables, the data are arranged so that column 1 contains the USGS-assigned sample numbers. These nunbers correspond to the nwnbers shown on the sits location **map** (plate 1). Columns in which the element headings show the letter "S" below the element symbol are mission spectrographic analyses; **"AA"** indicates atmic absorption analyses; "ICP/p" indicates inductively coupled plasma-atomic mission spectroscopy, partial analysis. **A** letter "N" in the tables indicates that a given element was looked **for** but not detected at the lower limit of determination shown for that element in table 1. For emission spectrographic<br>analyses, a "less than" symbol (<) entered in the tables in front of the lower limit of determination indicates that an element was observed but was below the lowest reporting value. For **AA** and **ICP** analyses, a "less than" syrrbol (<) entered in the tables in front of the lower limit of determination indicates that an element was below the lowest reporting value. If an element was observed but was above the highest reporting value, a "greater than" symbol 0) was entered in the tables in front of the upper limit of determination. If an element was not looked for in a sample, two dashes (--) are entered in tables 3 and 4 in place of an analytical value.

### **REFERENCES CITED**

- Berg, H.C., Jones, D.L., and Coney,P.J., 1978, Map showing Pre-Cenozoic tectonostratigraphic terranes of southeastern Alaska and adjacent areas: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 78-1085, scale 1:1,000,000, 2 sheets.
- Berg, J.C., **Jones,** D.L., and Richter, D.H., 1972, Gravin-Nutzotin belt, Tectonic significance of an upper Mesozoic sedimentary and volcanic sequence in southern and southeastern Alaska in Geological Survey research 1972: U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 800-0, **p.** D1- 024.
- Brew, C.A. and Ford, A.B.,1984, Tectonostratigraphic tsrraines in the Coast plutonic-metam3rphic ccmplex, southeastern Alaska, in Bartsch-Winkler, **S,,** and Reed, K.M., eds., The United States Geological Survey in Alaska: Miscellaneous geologic research 1982: U.S. Geological Survey Circular 939, p. 90-93.
- Grimes, D. J,, and Marranzina, A. P., 1968, Direct-current arc and alternating-current spark emission spectrographic field methods for the semiquantitative analysis of geologic materials: U.S. Geological Survey Circular 591, 6 p.
- Koirtyohann, **S. R., and** Khalil, **Moheb,** 1976, Variables in the determination of mercury by cold vapor atomic absorption: Analytical Chemistry, 48, **p.** 136-139.
- McDanaf, **S.K.,** Arbogast, **B.F.,** and Cathrall, J.B., 1991, Analytical results and sample locality map of stream-sediment and heavy-mineralconcentrate samples from the Craig Study Area; Craig, Dixon Entrance, Ketchikan, and Prince Rupert quadrangles, Alaska: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 91-36A, p. 122.
- Monger, J.W.H. and Berg, W.C., 1987, Lithotectonic terrane **map** of western Canada and southeastern Alaska: U.S. Geological Survey Miscellaneous Field Studies Map **MF** 1874-Bm 21 **p.,** scale 1:2,500,000.
- Motoaka, J.M., 1988, An exloration geochemical technique for the detemination of preconcentrated organmetallic halides by ICP-AES: Applied Spectroscopy, v. 42, no. 7, p. 1293-1296.
- Motooka, J, M., and Grimes, D. J., 1976, Analytical precisian of one-sixth order semiquantitative spectrographic analyses: U.S. Geological Survey Circular 738, 25 p.
- Thompson, C. **E.,** Nakagawa, **H.** M., and Van Sickle, G. **H,,** 1968, Rapid analysis for gold in geologic materials, in Geological Survey research 1968: U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 600-8, p. **B130-0132.**
- VanTrunp, George, Jr., and Miesch, A. T., 1977, The U.S. Geological Survey RASS-STATPAC system for **management** and statistical reduction of geochemical data: Computers and Geosciences, v. 3, p. 475-488.
- Wahrhatig, Clyde, 1965, Phhsiographic divisions of Alaska: U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 482, 52 **p.,** 6 plates.

# **TABLE 1.--Limits of detwmination for the spectrographic analysis of stream sediments, based on a lo-mg sarple**

[The values shown are the **lower 1** imits of determination assigned by the Grimes and Marranzino method, **except** for those values in parentheses, which are the lower values assigned by the Myers and others method. The spectrographic limits of detennination for heavy-mineral-concentrate **sarrples** are **based** on a **5-mg**  sample, and are therefore two reporting intervals higher than the limits given for rocks.]



# **TABLE 2.--Chemical methods used**

**[AA atmi c** absorption ; **I CP** = **inductive** 1 **y coup** 1 **ed plasma spectroscopy]** 



 $\epsilon$ **Table 3. RENTS OF ANALYSIS OF STREM-SEDIMENT SAMPLES**  detected; (, detected but below the limit of determination shown; ), determined to be greater than the value shown.]



 $1<sub>0</sub>$ 

# **Table 3.** contirmed - **REWTS OF ANALYSIS OF STREAM-SEOIHENT SMtES <sup>6</sup>**

 $\sim$ 

 $\rightarrow$ 

 $\mathcal{A}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ 

J.

 $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{A}}$ 



# Table 3. continued - RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF STREAM-SEDIMENT SAMPLES

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 



 $\bar{t}$ 

 $12$ 

 $\epsilon$ 

# **Table 3. continued** - **RESULTS** OF **ANALYSIS** OF **STREAM-SEDIMENT SAMPLES**

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}))$  . The  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L})$ 

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $-$ 

 $\blacktriangleleft$ 

 $\sim$ 

 $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 



 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

### Table 4. RESULTS OF **ANALYSIS** OF **HEAVY-NINER4L-CONCWTRArE SMES**  detected; (, detected but **below** the **limit** of &ternination shown; ), **determined** to **be greater than the value**  shown .I



 $14$ 

# Table 4. continued - RESULTS OF ANALYSIS OF HEAVY-HINERAL-CONCENTRATE SAMPLES

 $\cdot$ 



----

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 



 $\sigma$ 

 $\mathcal{L}$ 



 $\label{eq:1.1} \frac{1}{\|x\|^{2}}\leq \frac{$ 

 $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{q})$  , and  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{q})$  , and  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{q})$ 

 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$ 

 $\frac{1}{\pm}$