**Division of Geological** & **Geophysical Surveys** 

### **PUBLIC-DATA FILE 96-18**

# **MAJOR AND TRACE ELEMENT ANALYSES OF CRETACEOUS PLUTONIC ROCKS IN THE FAIRBANKS MINING DISTRICT, ALASKA**

by

R.J. Newbeny Department of Geology and Geophysics University of Alaska Fairbanks

November 1996

### THIS REPORT HAS NOT BEENREVIEWEDFOR TECHNICAL CONTENT (EXCEPT AS NOTED IN **TEXT)** OR FOR CONFORMITY TO THE EDITORIAL STANDARDS OFDGGS .

Released by

STATE OF ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES Division of Geological & Geophysical Surveys 794 University Avenue, Suite 200 Fairbanks, Alaska 99709-3645

## **MAJOR AND TRACE ELEMENT ANALYSES OF CRETACEOUS PLUTONIC ROCKS IN THE FAIRBANKS MINING DISTRICT, ALASKA**

#### **RJ NEWBERRY, Dept Geology, Univ Alaska, Fairbanks, Ak 99775**

Cretaceous granitic rocks comprise a small, but important part of the Fairbanks mining district, as they are spatially and temporally associated with much of the lode mineralization (Newberry et al., 1995). Rb/Sr, K-Ar, Ar-Ar and U-Pb dating of the quartz-rich plutonic rocks indicates that they were intruded at about 92 Ma; a small syenite plug on 07Connor Creek has a U-Pb age of 110 Ma (Newberry et al., 1996). As part of a continuing study of the geology of the Fairbanks mining district, granitic rocks have been collected and analyzed since 1975, but there has been no systematic compilation of major and trace element data. This report presents all available public sector analyses performed between 1980 and 1996, together with rock descriptions and locations.

Most of the analyses presented are from unweathered rocks showing no megascopic and little or no microscopic evidence for hydrothermal alteration (analyses 1 to 105). Up to 5% of the mafic minerals in these rocks show evidence for chloritization and plagioclase feldspars may exhibit a slight "dusting" by sericite. Consequently, the trace and major element contents of these rocks primarily reflect their primary igneous compositions. A few of the analyses presented (analyses 106 to 124) show hand specimen and/or thin section evidence for sigmficant hydrothermal alteration: mafic minerals altered to chlorite +/- calcite  $+/-$  white mica  $+/-$  epidote  $+/-$  rutile and feldspars altered to white mica  $+/-$  quartz. Most of the analyzed samples do not contain obvious veining, however. The elemental contents of these rocks are only partly representative of the original magmatic compositions: "immobile" elements, such as Ti, Zr, Y, Nb, and Ga have changed the least, and "mobile" elements, such as Na, K, Ca, As, Cu, Sb, and Zn have probably changed the most.

About half of the major element analyses (Table 2) were performed by X-ray fluorescence (XRF) on hsed glass disks by the ADGGS between 1980 and 1984. Some of these analyses were tabulated in

Burns et al. (1991), but accurate locations were not given. The remaining major element analyses were performed by several different commercial laboratories using XRF or Li-metaborate fusion/Inductively Coupled Plasma (ICP) techniques. A few samples were analyzed by XRF using pressed pellets at the University of Alaska. I consider only the  $TiO<sub>2</sub>$  values for these analyses to be truly quantitative and only list them. All major elements are listed in terms of weight percent oxides. Replicate analyses of split samples indicates that these values have uncertainties of approximately  $+/- 2\%$  of the amount stated.

The samples were analyzed for trace elements (Tables 3-5) at a variety of laboratories, including the ADGGS atomic absorption (AA) lab, the University of Alaska XRF lab, and several commercial labs. The samples analyzed were split from the pulps remaining from the original major element analysis. Au, As, Cr, Cs, Eu, Hf, Lu. Nd, Sc, Sm, Ta, Tb, Th, and U were determined by Instrumental Neutron Activation Analysis (INAA). Ce, La, and Sb were mostly determined by **INAA;** a few samples were analyzed by XRF at the University of Alaska. Hg, Ag, Bi, Co, Cu, Li, Mo, Ni, Pb, and Zn were determined by **AA** andlor ICP. B was determined by delayed neutron counting. Cl and F were determined by specific ion electrode. W was determined by colorometric analysis and/or INAA. Ba. Ga, Nb, Rb. Sn, Sr, V, Y, and Zr were determined by XRF, mostly at the University of Alaska (as described in Newbeny et al., 1994). A few samples were analyzed by XRF at a commercial lab. XRF analyses were also performed on several samples for the elements As, CI, Co, Cr, Cu, F, Mo, Ni, Pb, Sb, Sc, Th, and Zn at the University of Alaska, as a check on analyses performed by other techniques at other labs. Five samples were also re-analyzed by ICP-MS at the Institute for Advanced Studies, Potsdam, Germany, and showed excellent agreement with the values given here. Replicate analyses of split samples and multiple analyses by several different techniques indicates that for most trace elements present at concentrations > 10 ppm, concentrations have uncertainties of approximately +I- 5% of the amount stated. Uncertainties for elements present at lower concentrations are approximately  $+/-10\%$  of the amount stated.

#### **REFERENCES**

- Burns, L.E., Newberry, R.J., and Solie, D.N., 1991, Quartz Normative plutonic rocks of interior Alaska and their favorability for association with gold: Alaska Division of Geological and Geophysical Surveys, Report of Investigation 9 1-3, 58 **p.**
- Newbeny, R.J., Wiltse, M.A., Queen, L.K., and Pinney, D.S., 1994, Geochemical Major-Oxide and Trace element data for rock samples collected in the Circle mining district, June, 1993: **Ak** Division of Geological and Geophysical Surveys, PDF 94-32A, 5 p.
- Newberry, R.J., McCoy, D.T., and Brew, D.A., 1995, Phitonic-hosted gold ores in Alaska: Igneous vs. Metamorphic origins, Resource Geology Japan, Spec. Issue, no. 18., pp. 57-100.
- Newbeny, R. J., Bundtzen, T.K., Clautice, K.H., Combellick, R.A., Douglas, T., Laird, G.M., Liss, S.A., Pinney, D.S., Reifenstuhl, R.R., and Solie, D.N., 1996, Preliminary geologic map of the Fairbanks mining district, Alaska, Alaska Division of Geological and Geophysical Surveys, PDF 96-16, 2 sheets, 32 pp...



 $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\text{max}}$ 



 $-$ 

 $\sim$ 

 $\overline{a}$ 



 $\label{eq:2.1} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}})) \leq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{L}^{\text{max}}_{\mathcal{L}}))$ 







![](_page_10_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_16.jpeg)

÷.

 $\sim$   $\alpha$ 

![](_page_13_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_13.jpeg)

 $\sim$ 

![](_page_15_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_15.jpeg)

 $\sim$   $\sim$ 

![](_page_17_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_5.jpeg)