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ABSTRACT

The geology of the 1:24,000 Roanoke East, Alabama, Quadrangle has been determined to be of high mapping priority by the State Geologic Mapping Advisory Committee due to the rapid development along the I-85 corridor west of Atlanta, Georgia. Objectives for this study are: (1) to map and describe lithologies and their distributions; (2) to analyze structures and fabrics; (3) to produce a vector ArcGIS geologic map of the Roanoke East, Alabama, Quadrangle; (4) to characterize the Long Island Creek Gneiss through both geochronological and geochemical analyses, and; (5) to synthesize the geologic history. The key findings are seven-fold. (1) The lithologies of the Jacksons Gap Group within the Roanoke East Quadrangle are not easily divided into separate, mappable units as a result of their lithological similarities and their intergradational nature. The current author divides the lithologies of the Jacksons Gap Group within the Roanoke East Quadrangle into two main lithofacies types: a structurally lower section defined mostly by garnetiferous-graphitic-quartz-biotite schists and phyllites interlayered with micaceous quartzites; and an upper section of variably graphitic, garnetiferous-sericite-chlorite schists and phyllites, with no interlayered quartzites. The Long Island Creek Gneiss intrudes these units. (2) The lithologies of the Jacksons Gap Group within the Roanoke East Quadrangle are also not easily distinguishable from lithologies of the immediately adjacent units (the Emuckfaw Group and schists within the Waresville Schist). Outcrops of cataclasites defining the Abanda and Katy Creek faults
bounding the Jacksons Gap Group were not observed and, hence, placing the upper and lower boundaries of the package proved to be a difficult task. (3) The current author defines the upper limit of the Emuckfaw Group within the Roanoke East Quadrangle based on the presence/lack of metagraywackes, which occur together with rare, thin amphibolites. I also have defined the lower limit of the Waresville Schist by the occurrence of amphibolites, interpreting them to be part of the metavolcanics of the Dadeville Complex. This contrasts with the placement of the same contacts by workers in Georgia, who instead place these amphibolites within lithologies of the Brevard shear zone. (4) The Long Island Creek Gneiss that intrudes the Jacksons Gap Group does not appear to cross over the boundaries of the Brevard shear zone within the area of the Roanoke East Quadrangle. (5) Early D1 fabrics and lithologic contacts are locally truncated at the Katy Creek fault where syn- to late-D1 fabrics parallel it, implying the juxtaposition of the Dadeville Complex and Jacksons Gap Group during a syn- to late-D1/M1 event. An inverted metamorphic gradient along the Katy Creek fault may have been formed as a result of down-heating that occurred during the emplacement of the hot Dadeville Complex on top of the cooler Jacksons Gap Group. (6) The age of Rock Mills Granite Gneiss remains to be constrained geochronologically, but it is younger than the 466 Ma Waresville Schist it intrudes (VanDervoort et al., 2017). (7) Based on available evidence, the Long Island Creek Gneiss is a highly fractionated melt emplaced at 293.1 +/- 5.3 Ma during the end of the period of Alleghanian plutonism spanning between ~330 and 295 Ma (Lin, 2015), placing a maximum on the timing of right-slip movement along the Brevard shear zone.
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Plate 1: Geologic Map of the 1:24,000 Roanoke East, Alabama, Quadrangle
INTRODUCTION

The Roanoke East Quadrangle is located within the Piedmont province of the southern Appalachians in east-central Alabama, and encompasses rocks from two major terranes, the eastern Blue Ridge (EBR) and the Inner Piedmont (IP), that are separated by the Brevard fault zone (BFZ). Within the BFZ is a group of related lithologies of uncertain affinity, called the Jacksons Gap Group (JGG) (Bentley and Neathery, 1970). The Long Island Creek Gneiss (LICG) is the most continuously exposed granitic body intruding lithologies of the BFZ of Alabama and Georgia, yet the unit is poorly understood and remains to be geochronologically and geochemically characterized in Alabama. As a whole, the Piedmont of Alabama includes metasedimentary, metavolcanic, and metaplutonic rocks that formed as a result of the processes associated with the Taconic (Ordovician), Acadian-Neoacadian (Devonian-Mississippian), and Alleghanian (Carboniferous) orogenic events (Bentley and Neathery, 1970; Hatcher, 1989, 2005; VanDervoort et al., 2015). Previous regional reconnaissance mapping of rocks in and surrounding the Roanoke East Quadrangle provided a limited amount of structural and metamorphic data (Bentley and Neathery, 1970; Medlin and Crawford, 1973; Higgins et al., 1988). The Roanoke East Quadrangle lies west of Atlanta, Georgia near the I-85 corridor, a main transportation route between Montgomery, Alabama and Atlanta, Georgia, in an area where development is expected (Steltenpohl, 2014). Detailed geologic mapping has been limited in the Roanoke East Quadrangle, and is needed for
several reasons: (1) urban planning and development; (2) for Source Water Protection studies as required by the Alabama Department of Environmental Management; (3) for identifying and clarifying the presence of natural resources; (4) to address issues concerning the geologic evolution of the Appalachian orogenic belt, particularly in regard to the Brevard fault zone (Steltenpohl, 2014), and; (5) to further constrain the LICG and its role in the tectonic evolution of the southernmost Appalachians.

**Location and Physiographic Setting**

The 1:24,000 Roanoke East, Alabama, Quadrangle (Latitudes: 33°07′30″N and 33°15′N; Longitudes: 85°15′W and 85°22′30″W) lies within Randolph County in the Piedmont province of the southern Appalachians in east-central Alabama, and just crosses into Heard County, Georgia to the northeast (Figures 1 and 2). The cities and communities in the Roanoke East Quadrangle are Roanoke, Rock Mills, Bacon Level, Lime, Center Chapel, Springfield, Paran, High Shoals, and Wehadkee within Randolph County. Elevations range from 660 feet along the banks of Wehadkee Creek southeast of Rock Mills, to more than 1200 feet on hills east of High Shoals in the northwestern corner of the quadrangle. Topographic features include rolling hills accompanied by prominent ridges formed by the differential weathering of more silica-rich units (Bentley and Neathery, 1970). Streams within the quadrangle drain into Lake Martin, located approximately 40.5 miles (65 km) to the southwest of Roanoke, Alabama.
Geologic Setting

The eastern Blue Ridge is the structurally lowest terrane in the study area (Figures 1 and 2), and consists of two major metasedimentary packages, the Wedowee and Emuckfaw groups. To the northwest, the Wedowee Group is located structurally above the Hollins Line fault and has been traditionally described as being composed of variably graphitic garnet mica schist interlayered with quartzite, biotite paragneiss (metawacke), feldspathic garnet mica schist, amphibolites, and is intruded by Devonian to Carboniferous metagranitoids (Bentley and Neathery, 1970; Neathery and Reynolds, 1975; Allison, 1992; Stowell et al., 1996; Schwartz et al., 2011; Tull et al., 2012). The Emuckfaw Group overlies the Wedowee and is bound by the Brevard fault zone to the southeast. The Emuckfaw is a sequence of undifferentiated metagraywackes, graphitic and aluminous schists, quartzites, and amphibolites that is intruded by Ordovician- to Silurian-aged plutons (Zana Granite and Kowaliga Gneiss) (Neathery and Reynolds, 1975; Hawkins, 2013; Sagul, 2016). Traditionally, the dextral strike-slip Alexander City fault (ACF) has been interpreted as the boundary between the Wedowee and Emuckfaw Groups (Figure 2) (Neathery and Reynolds, 1975; Steltenpohl et al., 2013), while many workers interpret it as a normal fault that doesn’t define the entire boundary between the two units (Drummond, 1986; Allison, 1992; Drummond et al., 1997; Tull et al., 2012; Harstad and Barineau, 2014; Barineau et al., 2015; Roop-Eckart and Barineau, 2015).

The rocks of the eastern Blue Ridge have most commonly been described as the outboard slope/rise facies of the Neoproterozoic Iapetus-facing Laurentian margin, and some workers have suggested that a distal back-arc basin evolved on top of it (Steltenpohl, 2005; Tull et al., 2012, 2014).
Figure 1: Geologic map of the southern Appalachians, with the limits of Figure 2 outlined in the yellow dashed line and the approximate location of the Roanoke East, Alabama Quadrangle in red. Modified after Merschat et al., 2010 (VanDervoort and Steltenpohl, 2015).
Figure 2: Geologic map of the Alabama Piedmont (from Osborne et al., 1988, Steltenpohl, 2005, and Steltenpohl et al., 2013) showing the location of the Roanoke East (RE) Quadrangle (outlined in red).
To the southeast, the Brevard fault zone separates metasedimentary and metaplutonic rocks of the eastern Blue Ridge from metavolcanic and metaplutonic rocks of the Inner Piedmont (Figures 1 and 2) (Bentley and Neathery, 1970). The Brevard fault zone has been the focus of intense study and debate among southern Appalachian geologists for over five decades, but is typically interpreted as a polyphase fault zone that initially formed in response to Acadian-Neoacadian thrusting, overprinted by Alleghanian brittle-plastic dextral strike-slip shearing (Vauchez, 1987; Hatcher, 1989, 2005; Steltenpohl et al., 2013).

Bounded by the Abanda fault to the northwest and the Katy Creek fault to the southeast (Figure 2), the Jacksons Gap Group defines the lithologies of the Brevard fault zone in Alabama. The Jacksons Gap Group is a narrow zone (up to 2.8 km wide) of strongly to weakly deformed metasiliciclastic and metapelitic rocks (Bentley and Neathery, 1970; Sterling, 2006; White, 2007). VanDervoort and Steltenpohl (2015) recognized that in the type locality of the Abanda Fault (Abanda, Alabama, Wadley South 7.5” quadrangle), widely spaced C-planes and high angles between them and complementary S-planes in phyllonites imply relatively lower degrees of shear stress.

The Jacksons Gap Group is generally described as a sequence of undifferentiated graphitic button-schists, phyllites, sericitic phyllites, quartzites, and graphitic quartzites that commonly are phyllonitized and mylonitized (Bentley and Neathery, 1970). Lithologies of the Jacksons Gap Group are compatible with an origin along the ancient rifted Laurentian margin, similar to the Emuckfaw Group, although the former is of a distinctly shallower marine depositional setting. Sterling et al. (2005) reported the rare presence of rare continental-rift meta-basalts within the Jacksons Gap Group. The
Jacksons Gap Group in Alabama typically lacks granitic intrusive rocks, causing it to contrast sharply with rocks above and below it (i.e., the Dadeville Complex and the eastern Blue Ridge, respectively). The Long Island Creek Gneiss (LICG), however, is the most continuously exposed granitic gneiss sheet affected by shearing within the Brevard fault zone. The LICG is typically a titanite-epidote-biotite-quartz-feldspar gneissic granite that is medium- to coarse-grained and moderately- to well-foliated and lineated; locally the granite contains muscovite (Crawford et al., 1999). The only age reported for the LICG is a Rb-Sr isochron age of 460 Ma (Sinha and Higgins, 1987), which likely is not a robust age date, given problems of mobility of these elements. An objective of the current thesis is to re-date the LICG using more modern U-Pb methods.

The Dadeville Complex of the Inner Piedmont terrane is the structurally highest tectonostratigraphic unit in the field area, and occurs directly southeast of the Brevard fault zone. The Dadeville Complex comprises interlayered schist, metaquartzite, and amphibolite (Waresville Formation), layered to massive amphibolite (Ropes Creek Amphibolite), tonalitic gneiss (Waverly Gneiss), aluminous schist (Agricola Schist), and two different suites of felsic intrusives (the Camp Hill Gneiss and the Rock Mills Granite Gneiss) (Bentley and Neathery, 1970). VanDervoort et al. (2017) report dates for the Waresville Formation at 466.6 ± 5.6 Ma, the Ropes Creek Amphibolite at 458.6 ± 5.6 Ma, the Waverly Gneiss at 461 ± 11 Ma, and the Camp Hill Gneiss at 487 ± 11 Ma; an age of 460 ± 4 Ma for the Camp Hill Gneiss is reported by Farris et al. (2015). To the southeast of the Dadeville Complex is the Opelika Complex (Figure 2), which initially was considered part of the Inner Piedmont as well. However, several workers have documented that the Opelika Complex correlates to rocks of the eastern Blue Ridge and
even perhaps parts of the Jacksons Gap Group, and it is now believed that only the Dadeville Complex is of Inner Piedmont affinity (Bentley and Neathery, 1970; Grimes and Steltenpohl, 1993; Keefer, 1992; Steltenpohl et al., 2005; Abrahams, 2014; Tull et al., 2014; VanDervoort et al., 2015).

**Previous Investigations**

Earlier investigations of the rocks in and surrounding the Roanoke East Quadrangle were primarily concerned with economic endeavors, describing gold occurrences, mine locations, mineralogy, and brief accounts of the regional geology (Tuomey, 1858; Phillips, 1892; Adams, 1930; Park, 1935; Pardee and Park, 1948). Adams (1926, 1930) first described the Wedowee formation, and correlated it with the rocks of the Brevard zone, interpreting them as altered Wedowee formation. Bentley and Neathery (1970) performed a significant amount of regional work and delimited the Brevard fault zone and Inner Piedmont, providing a foundation for geologic studies by subsequent workers. In contrast with Adams’ work, Bentley and Neathery (1970) designated the Wedowee formation as the Wedowee Group. They also defined the rocks between the Wedowee Group and the Brevard fault zone as the Heard Group, and the associated felsic intrusives as the Zana Granite and Kowaliga Gneiss. Bentley and Neathery (1970) did not specify a type section for lithologies of the Brevard fault zone, but they did describe it as a zone of deformation and cataclasis, bounded by the Abanda fault to the north and the Katy Creek fault to the south. Structurally above the Brevard fault zone, the same authors divided the Inner Piedmont into the Dadeville Complex and the Opelika Complex, and defined several different mappable units (e.g., the Waresville
Formation, Agricola Schist, Camp Hill Gneiss, Ropes Creek Amphibolite, and the Boyds Creek Mafic Complex). These authors also suggested that the southern Appalachian Piedmont is allochthonous along a west-directed thrust comprising the Brevard fault zone, along with faults framing the Pine Mountain basement window (i.e., Towaliga, Bartletts Ferry, and Goat Rock fault zones). A similar conclusion was later proposed by The Consortium for Continental Reflection Profiling (COCORP), based on their seismic-reflection profiling (Cook et al., 1979).

Following the initial work of Bentley and Neathery (1970), the rocks of the eastern Blue Ridge were renamed the Heard Group (Neathery and Reynolds, 1973), the Emuckfaw formation (Neathery and Reynolds, 1973), and then the Emuckfaw Group (Raymond et al., 1988). Subsequent work focused on characterizing the development and timing of emplacement of the Zana and Kowaliga intrusive bodies within the Emuckfaw, employing mapping as well as geochemical and geochronological techniques. Over the years, several authors have reported that the Zana and Kowaliga are genetically related (Muangonoicharoen, 1975; Stoddard, 1983; Hawkins, 2013). An age of 461 ± 12 Ma for both the Zana and Kowaliga (using multi-grain U-Pb zircon analysis) was reported by Russell (1987), along with a Rb-Sr whole-rock ages of 437 Ma and 395 Ma, respectively, with uncertainties on the order of ± 100 Ma. Hawkins (2013) employed Secondary Ionization Mass Spectrometry (SIMS) U-Pb isotopic analysis on zircons from the Kowaliga Gneiss and reported a crystallization age of 440 Ma. More recently, Sagul (2016) obtained ages on both the Zana and Kowaliga suggesting that these plutons formed during a period of magmatism from ~480 to ~455 Ma.
Wielchowsky (1983) described rocks within and adjacent to the Brevard fault zone from the Alabama-Georgia state line southwest to Jacksons Gap, Alabama as a “lithologically distinctive” metasedimentary sequence within a shear zone that flattens with depth. This is compatible with the COCORP seismic profile that suggests the fault rooted at depth into the southern Appalachian master décollement (Cook et al., 1979). Further work reported in Auburn University student theses between 1988 and 2015 have made significant contributions to the understanding of the geology and gold/precious metal occurrences within the Jacksons Gap Group through detailed geologic mapping, structural analysis, and geochemical and geochronological analysis (Johnson, 1988; Keefer, 1992; Grimes, 1993; Reed, 1994; McCullars, 2001; Sterling, 2006; White, 2007; Hawkins, 2013; Abrahams, 2014; Singleton and Steltenpohl, 2014; Poole, 2015; VanDervoort, 2015).
TECTONOSTRATIGRAPHY

Tectonostratigraphic terranes exposed on the Roanoke East Quadrangle comprise, from northwest to southeast, the eastern Blue Ridge, the Jacksons Gap Group, and the Inner Piedmont. Eastern Blue Ridge units in this study are the Wedowee and Emuckfaw groups, the latter of which is intruded by the Kowaliga Gneiss, occupying the northwestern half of the quadrangle. Metasedimentary rocks of the Jacksons Gap Group are intruded by the Long Island Creek Gneiss and occur as an approximately 1.25-mile wide band exposed diagonally across the middle portion of the quadrangle. The Inner Piedmont comprises the Waresville Schist and Rock Mills Granite Gneiss of the Dadeville Complex. Units shown on Plate 1 are described below, from the southeast to the northwest, or from structurally highest to structurally lowest order. Unit names and symbols listed below correspond to those found on Plate 1.

The current author has recognized features and relationships associated with faults and/or shear zones exposed on the Roanoke East Quadrangle, and also those reported for quadrangles along strike to the southwest and northeast, that lead her to suggest modifications be made for some of their names. The gradational nature of lithologies along the boundary between the Wedowee and Emuckfaw groups on the Roanoke East quad is associated with variably developed phyllonitic shear zones but these do not require a faulted relationship between these units. Combined with observations reported for shearing but not fault displacement along this boundary to the northeast and
southwest (Muangonoicharoen, 1975; Barineau and Tull, 2012; Harstad and Barineau, 2014; Roop-Eckart and Barineau, 2015), the current author prefers using the term Alexander City shear zone for these distributed shears. Likewise, field and structural studies along the Brevard fault zone in Alabama clearly document that phyllonites and mylonites are not simply restricted to the confines of the Jacksons Gap Group being partitioned by its flanking faults, the Abanda and the Katy Creek, respectively to the northwest and southeast (e.g., Sterling, 2006; Hawkins, 2013; Abrahams, 2014; Poole 2015; and VanDervoort, 2015). Lithologies at the top of the Emuckfaw Group are indistinguishable from parts of the lower Jacksons Gap Group within the Roanoke East Quadrangle, and previous workers have had similar problems placing the boundary between the two units (White, 2007; Reynolds and Steltenpohl, 2009; Hawkins, 2013).

For these reasons, the current author prefers using the term Abanda shear zone. In contrast, the Katy Creek fault juxtaposes rocks of two terranes, the Jacksons Gap Group and the Dadeville Complex arc (Taconic), and, therefore, the term Katy Creek fault is retained. Given the preponderance of distributed shear zones occurring outside of the Jacksons Gap Group, however, the current author favors the term Brevard shear zone rather than Brevard fault zone, and hence the former is used below.

Due to the Roanoke East Quadrangle being located partially on the Alabama-Georgia state line, consideration was taken for the correlation (or lack thereof) of various faults/shears as previously reported between the two states. Beginning in the northwest of the quadrangle, the Alexander City shear zone roughly correlates with the Omaha fault described by workers in Georgia (Crawford and Kath, 2015), yet the Roopville fault was not observed during the current study. The Abanda shear zone correlates with the
Chattahoochee fault described by workers in Georgia. However it is placed much further to the southeast than the Chattahoochee fault due to a differing interpretation of the boundaries of the Brevard shear zone between Alabama (based on lithology; i.e., the JGG) and Georgia (based on structure). The Long Island fault reported in Crawford and Kath (2015) is not noted as a fault/shear in Alabama, although the Long Island Creek Gneiss is clearly stretched and sheared. The Katy Creek fault correlates directly with the Claighamont fault of Georgia.

**Lithostratigraphic Units**

**Inner Piedmont/Dadeville Complex**

The structurally highest terrane in the study area is the Inner Piedmont, represented within the Roanoke East Quadrangle by the Waresville Schist and the Rock Mills Granite Gneiss of the Dadeville Complex. The Waresville Schist is described as a package of mostly metamorphosed mafic and felsic metavolcanics, and the Rock Mills Granite Gneiss is a granitic metaplutonic body. These lithologies make up the remaining southern half of the Roanoke East Quadrangle where, typical of the nature of the Dadeville Complex, outcrops are more difficult to find.

**Rock Mills Granite Gneiss (Idrm)**

The Rock Mills Granite Gneiss is named for large pavement exposures (Figures 3 and 4) in Rock Mills, Randolph County, Alabama, which is located within the Roanoke East Quadrangle (Raymond et al., 1988). The Rock Mills Granite Gneiss is a well-foliated, medium- to coarse-grained granitic gneiss containing biotite, muscovite, quartz,
Figure 3: Photograph of the large pavement exposures and waterfall on Wehadkee Creek formed by the Rock Mills Granite Gneiss in Rock Mills, Alabama for which the unit was named. View is looking north-northwest (33°9'30.96", -85°17'21.84").

Figure 4: Another photograph of the pavement exposures in Rock Mills, Alabama on Wehadkee Creek. View is looking southeast, from the same location as Figure 3.
potassium feldspar, and varying minor amounts of epidote and garnet. In fresh exposures, the Rock Mills Granite Gneiss commonly is white to light tan in color. Where weathered, aligned platy minerals retain the metamorphic foliation within the soil, which is a light tan color. The Rock Mills Granite Gneiss typically exhibits spheroidal weathering patterns (Figure 5) that contributes to the gentle, rolling hill topography of the southern portion of the quadrangle (Figure 6).

**Waresville Schist (Idws)**

The Waresville Schist is mostly a bimodal metavolcanic sequence of interlayered mafic and felsic schists, and thinly banded to massive amphibolite (Figures 7 and 8). The mafic layers consist of very fine- to fine-grained amphibole-bearing schist and banded amphibolites (Figure 9), and are interpreted to be metamorphosed basalt lava flows. The felsic layers consist of a fine- to medium-grained schist containing varying amounts of quartz, plagioclase, potassium feldspar, and sericite; locally the schist contains minor amounts of pyrite. These felsic schists are interpreted to represent metamorphosed tonalitic lava flows. In fresh exposures, the mafic layers are a deep green to dark gray to black color, and the felsic layers are a white to light tan or light gray color. Mafic layers weather to a deep brick-red soil, and the felsic layers weather to a light tan soil. Along with these lithologies, the Waresville Schist also contains aluminous feldspar-rich schists that are locally difficult to distinguish from the schists of the Jacksons Gap Group. These schists are interlayered with the felsic and mafic lithologies previously described, and are interpreted as either metamorphosed ash or volcaniclastic deposits, but they are not distinguishable at the scale of Plate 1.
**Figure 5:** Photograph of the Rock Mills Granite Gneiss, displaying its typical spheroidal weathering pattern. Also note the subhorizontal foliation, typical of the Rock Mills Granite Gneiss. View is looking east-southeast (33°12'13.644", -85°15'25.308”).

**Figure 6:** Photograph of an open field within the southern portion of the Roanoke East Quadrangle, showing the gentle rolling hills resulting from weathering of the underlying Rock Mills Granite Gneiss. View is looking east-southeast (33°8'37.68", -85°15'19.8”).
Figure 7: Photograph of interlayered mafic and felsic schists of the Waresville Schist. View is looking to the east (33°12'4.32", -85°17'42").

Figure 8: Interlayered mafic and felsic schists of the Waresville Schist, near the contact with the Jacksons Gap Group where it becomes more difficult to distinguish between the two units (Waresville Schist and Jacksons Gap Group). View is looking to the southwest (33°9'50.076", -85°22'0.588").
Figure 9: Photograph of banded amphibolite within the Waresville Schist. View is looking to the north (33°11'15.72", -85°17'30.12").
*Jacksons Gap Group/Brevard Shear Zone*

Structurally above and separated from the eastern Blue Ridge by the Abanda shear zone, the rocks of the Jacksons Gap Group define the Brevard shear zone within the Roanoke East Quadrangle. These lithologies occupy an approximately 2 kilometer wide band that stretches across the middle of the quadrangle, from the western edge to the northeastern corner. Within the current area, the lithologies of the Jacksons Gap Group have been divided into three different mappable units: garnetiferous schist, micaceous quartzite, and sericite-chlorite phyllite. The Long Island Creek Gneiss intrudes these units.

*Long Island Creek Gneiss (Licg)*

Within the Roanoke East Quadrangle, the Long Island Creek Gneiss is a medium-to coarse-grained, moderately- to well-foliated epidote-muscovite-biotite-quartz-feldspar gneissic granite. It is intensely foliated and lineated with stretched grains, and it appears to be a simple gneiss with dark and light bands. The Long Island Creek Gneiss is a roughly tabular body that stretches across the middle portion of the Brevard shear zone and is stretched/sheared along the Katy Creek fault. In fresh exposures, it occurs as smooth, whale-back outcrops underlying ridges (Figure 10) and it weathers to a light tan soil.

*Sericite-Chlorite Phyllite (JGscp)*

At the structural top of the Jacksons Gap Group, a sericite-chlorite phyllite dominates and occurs as a fine- to medium-grained, well-foliated, locally graphitic
phyllite that contains varying amounts of garnet, quartz, muscovite, sercite, and chlorite. It is locally interlayered with garnetiferous schists that are identical to those seen within the Garnetiferous Quartz Schist of the Jacksons Gap Group. Close to the Katy Creek fault, and near the immediately adjacent Waresville Schist, it can be difficult to distinguish between the two units. In fresh outcrops, it is light olive-green to silvery-gray, and it weathers to a deep brick-red soil.

**Garnetiferous Quartz Schist (JGgqs)**

At the structural base of the Jacksons Gap Group within the study area, lithologies are dominated by a locally graphitic, fine- to medium-grained garnetiferous biotite-sercite-quartz schist. In fresh outcrops, the Garnetiferous Quartz Schist is typically light gray to light tan, and weathers to a light tan to light reddish soil that contains weathered-out mica fish and garnets (Figure 11). Kinematic indicators include asymmetric mica fish, which tend to weather out into ‘buttons,’ rolled garnet porphyroblasts, sigmoidal-shaped feldspar porphyroclasts, and asymmetrically folded quartz ribbons. The lithologies are difficult to distinguish from the immediately adjacent graphitic schists of the Emuckfaw Group.

**Micaceous Quartzite (JGmq)**

Found only towards the northeastern portion of the quadrangle, also at the base of the Jacksons Gap Group, is a fine- to medium-grained, well-foliated, micaceous quartzite that contains varying amounts of muscovite, biotite, sercite, quartz, and feldspar. In fresh exposures, it expresses itself in a ‘blocky’ fashion, and typically weathers to a light tan to
**Figure 10:** Photograph of an outcrop of steeply dipping Long Island Creek Gneiss in an open field. View is looking to the northeast (33°11'42.36", -85°20'44.16").

**Figure 11:** Photograph of moderately weathered Garnetiferous Quartz Schist of the Jacksons Gap Group, displaying typical soil colors and mica buttons on the ground. View is looking to the east (33°14'20.04", -85°16'13.8").
light reddish soil (Figure 12). Within the Roanoke East Quadrangle, this lithology only had one mappable band, but was found interlayered with the Garnetiferous Quartz Schist (JGgqs) in other locations in bands no more than approximately 0.5 meters thick.

**Eastern Blue Ridge**

The eastern Blue Ridge is the structurally lowest terrane in the region and, within the Roanoke East Quadrangle, is represented by the Wedowee Group, the Emuckfaw Group, and the Kowaliga Gneiss. These rocks occur structurally below the Abanda shear zone, which marks the structural bottom of the Brevard shear zone.

**Kowaliga Gneiss (Ekg)**

Within the Roanoke East Quadrangle, the Kowaliga Gneiss occurs as small tabular to lenticular pods, up to 2 kilometer long (along strike) and ~0.5 kilometers wide, of a strongly foliated granitic gneiss that intrude the schists, metawackes, and amphibolites of the Emuckfaw Group. The Kowaliga Gneiss is a medium- to coarse-grained augen gneiss containing quartz, potassium feldspar, plagioclase, biotite, and muscovite. The foliation is defined by the alignment of biotite and muscovite grains that drape the more competent potassium feldspar augen. Fresh rocks occur as either large pavement exposures or in rounded boulders. The Kowaliga Gneiss typically weathers to a light tan soil.

**Emuckfaw Group (Eem)**

The remainder of the eastern Blue Ridge within the Roanoke East Quadrangle is
Figure 12: Photograph of Micaceous Quartzite from the Jacksons Gap Group, exhibiting the typical 'blocky' outcrop and light tan to light red soil. View is looking to the north (33°14'21.984", -85°16'16.392").
occupied by the Emuckfaw Group, originally named for exposures along Emuckfaw Creek in Tallapoosa County, Alabama (Neathery and Reynolds, 1975). In the current study area, the Emuckfaw Group consists of an undifferentiated sequence of locally graphitic and garnetiferous muscovite-biotite-quartz-feldspar schist (sub-millimeter unidentified opaques also occur locally), fine-grained muscovite-biotite-quartz-feldspar metawacke, and thin, rare fine-grained banded amphibolite that are intruded by the Kowaliga Gneiss (Ekg). Like the Wedowee Group, these rocks also record a relatively high degree of dextral shear strain (Figures 13 and 14). In outcrop, the Emuckfaw Group varies from a bronzy (vermiculitic)- to silvery-gray sheen and weathers to a tan to reddish-orange sandy, muscovite- and garnet-rich soil. The metawackes are more competent than the surrounding schists, and tend to protrude in outcrops where the schist has been more deeply weathered, and may also be responsible for the formation of moderately strong topographic ridges within the Emuckfaw Group (see Plate 1). Outcrops of the amphibolites very rarely are fresh, and usually have been deeply weathered to a deep ochre-red color with a porous, punky, brick-bat appearance (Figure 15). Metawackes within the Emuckfaw Group vary anywhere between several centimeters to several meters in thickness, whereas the amphibolites are rarely more than roughly 20 centimeters thick. Locally, small pods (no larger than one foot in the longest dimension) of stretched and dismembered, coarse-grained, biotite-muscovite-feldspar-quartz granitic intrusives occur within the schists of the Emuckfaw Group (Figure 16).
Figure 13: Photograph of a well-developed S-C fabric within the schists of the Emuckfaw Group, indicating a dextral sense of shear. View looking to the southeast, down dip (33°14'35.16", -85°20'38.4º).

Figure 14: Photograph of an open Z-fold in a quartz vein within the Emuckfaw Group, again indicating a dextral sense of shear. View is looking toward the southeast, down dip (33°14'35.16", -85°20'38.4º).
Figure 15: Photograph of weathered banded amphibolite within the Emuckfaw Group, exhibiting the typical porous, punky brick-bat appearance. View is looking northeast (33°14′10.32″, -85°18′8.28″).

Figure 16: Photograph of a sheared, medium-grained schist in the Emuckfaw Group, with small, lens-like pods of felsic intrusives. Note- north arrow on scale is not pointing in proper direction. View is looking to the north (33°14′56.4″, -85°21′23.76″).
**Wedowee Group (Ewe)**

The Wedowee Group was named for exposures near Wedowee, Alabama (Neathery and Reynolds, 1975), and occupies a very small portion of the northwestern corner of the Roanoke East Quadrangle. The Wedowee Group in the current study area comprises only a graphitic garnetiferous muscovite-biotite-quartz-feldspar schist. Other workers (i.e., VanDervoort, 2015) have documented the occurrence of a banded to massive amphibolite (Beaverdam Amphibolite in the uppermost parts of the Wedowee Group). However, in the current study area, only minor amounts of float and outcrops of this lithology were found. The schists within the Wedowee Group locally record a relatively high degree of dextral shear strain, preserved in well-developed S-C fabrics. In outcrop, the schist is silvery-gray and weathers to an orange/reddish-orange soil. The contact between the Wedowee Group and the Emuckfaw Group, which is gradational over a ~100 meter section, was placed on the basis of graphite content, with the Wedowee Group being highly graphitic in the study area and the Emuckfaw Group being only variably graphitic.
METAMORPHISM

Three tectonometamorphic events have been documented in the southern Appalachians. The first at ~480 Ma (Taconian) is documented locally as high grade (eclogite and granulite facies) in parts of the eastern Blue Ridge of North Carolina (Abbott and Raymond, 1984, 1997; Absher and McSween, 1986; Raymond et al., 1989; Adams et al., 1995). The second event was at ~350 Ma (Neoacadian; Hatcher 1989, 2005) and the third at ~330 Ma (early or eo-Alleghanian), both under amphibolite facies and were accompanied by local shearing between ~300 and 285 Ma (late Alleghanian) (Steltenpohl and Kunk, 1993; Dennis and Wright, 1997; Carrigan et al., 2001; Kohn, 2001; Bream, 2002, 2003; Cyphers and Hatcher 2006; Stahr et al., 2006; Hames et al., 2007; McClellan et al., 2007; McDonald et al., 2007). Observations within the Roanoke East Quadrangle are compatible with this metamorphic history, where the rocks of the Dadeville Complex experienced Taconian effects, and the eastern Blue Ridge, Jacksons Gap Group, and Inner Piedmont appear to have gone through a period of lower greenschist- to upper amphibolite-facies, Barrovian-style prograde metamorphism (Neoacadian/early Alleghanian), followed by a second extensive retrogressive middle to upper greenschist-facies metamorphic event (Muangnoicharoen, 1975; Wielchowsky, 1983; Johnson, 1988; Steltenpohl et al., 1990; Reed, 1994; Sterling, 2006; Hawkins, 2013; Abrahams, 2014; Singleton and Steltenpohl, 2014; Poole, 2015; VanDervoort et al., 2015, 2017) (Figure 17).
Figure 17: Conditions suggested for peak metamorphism. Eastern Blue Ridge – purple, Jacksons Gap Group – green, and Dadeville Complex – orange (modified from Hawkins, 2013, and Poole, 2013).
Guthrie and Dean (1989) reported prograde mineral assemblages of kyanite + staurolite + muscovite + biotite + garnet + plagioclase + quartz within the Emuckfaw Group in Alabama, suggesting a lower to middle amphibolite-facies peak of metamorphism (Holdaway, 1971; Ernst, 1973). These same authors also interpreted the replacement of hornblende by actinolite and chlorite in rocks of the Emuckfaw Group as having occurred under middle to upper greenschist-facies retrogressive metamorphic conditions. Within the Kowaliga Gneiss, deformational microstructures in quartz and feldspar grains indicate subgrain rotation, bulging recrystallization, and grain boundary migration, compatible with lower amphibolite-facies conditions (Hawkins, 2013) (Figure 17).

The Jacksons Gap Group is dominated by a prograde mineral assemblage of muscovite + biotite + garnet + quartz, but this assemblage is not diagnostic of metamorphic grade. Along the structural top of the Jacksons Gap Group, in rocks adjacent to the Dadeville Complex, assemblages containing kyanite and garnet are documented; for example, directly southwest of the study area, staurolite + kyanite + sillimanite indicate middle amphibolite-facies peak metamorphic conditions (Johnson, 1988; Sterling, 2006). The Jacksons Gap Group presents an anomaly in that it contains primary sedimentary structures including cross stratification, graded bedding, and conglomerates, suggesting low degrees of metamorphism and strain (Bentley and Neathery, 1970; Sterling, 2006; Poole, 2015). The current investigation within the Roanoke East Quadrangle is consistent with the observation that metamorphic grade increases from greenschist-facies at the base of the Jacksons Gap Group to lower to middle amphibolite-facies at the top (Figure 17).
Within the Dadeville Complex, the Waresville Schist and Rock Mills Granite Gneiss contain prograde assemblages of garnet + biotite + muscovite + plagioclase, compatible with middle amphibolite-facies metamorphism, similar to findings by VanDervoort (2015) (Figure 17). Retrogressive greenschist- to lower amphibolite-facies mineral assemblages are not dominant, but observed as the alteration of hornblende to actinolite and chlorite. These observations are consistent with observations of the same rocks made by Johnson (1988), Steltenpohl and Moore (1988), Steltenpohl et al. (1990), Goldberg and Steltenpohl (1992), Reed (1994), Drummond et al. (1997), Sterling (2006), Abrahams (2014), Steltenpohl and Singleton (2014), Poole (2015), and VanDervoort (2015).

Recently, evidence for metamorphism during the Taconic (Cambrian to Early Ordovician) was recognized by VanDervoort et al. (2015) within rocks of the Dadeville Complex (Agricola Schist) of the Inner Piedmont. They report a prominent zircon-age population in their detrital data set at ~480 Ma with Th/U values <0.1, which they interpret as metamorphic overgrowth. This appears to be the first reported record of Taconic metamorphism in the southernmost Appalachians in Alabama. Specific assemblages supporting Taconian metamorphism in the Dadeville Complex of the current study were not conclusively documented based strictly on field observations.
STRUCTURE

Within the rocks underlying the Roanoke East Quadrangle, structural observations indicate that they have experienced and retain the evidence of at least four deformational events, D₁ through D₄. Table 1 is a summary of each of these deformational events. Structural and fabric elements produced as a result of a particular event are designated with the same subscript; for example: S₁, L₁, and F₁ formed during D₁; S₂, L₂, and F₂ formed in D₂; and so on. All structural measurements are imbedded as data files in the ArcGIS map). D₁ was associated with the formation of the principle metamorphic assemblages and fabrics found in rocks of the study area. While not observed in the Roanoke East Quadrangle, workers in the surrounding areas have documented the occurrence of primary sedimentary structures (i.e., conglomerates, upward fining sequences and cross-bedding) within siliciclastics of the Jacksons Gap Group, which define a primary bedding (S₀) that otherwise is transposed into the S₁ foliation, resulting in a composite S₀/S₁ fabric (Sterling, 2006; Poole, 2015). Peak, M₁, metamorphic conditions (lower greenschist- to amphibolite-facies) resulted in the formation of the dominant regional foliation (S₁), which is defined by the parallel alignment of phyllosilicate and inequant mineral grains. M₁ is interpreted as having occurred during Neoacadian (Late Devonian-early Mississippian) orogenesis. The primary composite S₀/S₁ fabric has an average strike and dip of N40°E, 43°SE in rocks of the Roanoke East Quadrangle (Figure 18).
**Middle Ordovician (Taconic) metamorphism recently has been documented in the Dadeville Complex (VanDervoort et al., 2015), although associated structures and fabrics are cryptic. Structures and fabrics observed in the Dadeville Complex within the Roanoke East Quadrangle did not reveal any new observations to identify pre-D1 (Taconian) effects.**

**Table 1. Summary of deformational events in the Roanoke East, Alabama, Quadrangle.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deformational Phases</th>
<th>Structural Elements</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S₀</td>
<td>Bedding - Compositional layering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* D₁</td>
<td>M₁</td>
<td>Regional prograde dynamothermal metamorphism of the EBR, JGG, and DC (Acadian; Devonian-Mississippian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S₁</td>
<td>Regional foliation (schistosity and gneissosity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early mylonitic movement along the BSZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syn- to late-peak metamorphic Katy Creek fault movement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L₁</td>
<td>Inequant mineral elongation lineation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D₂</td>
<td>M₂</td>
<td>Retrogressive reactivation of the Katy Creek fault (Alleghanian; Carboniferous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early movement along the Abanda and Alexander City shears</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F₂</td>
<td>Tight to isoclinal, intrafolial folding of S₀/S₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late-F₂ folding of the Tallassee synform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S₂</td>
<td>Local transposition of S₁ into S₂ in the JGG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Composite S-C mylonitic fabric indicating oblique dextral-normal movement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D₃</td>
<td>M₃</td>
<td>Upper greenschist-facies reactivation of the Abanda and Alexander City faults (Alleghanian; Carboniferous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F₃</td>
<td>Asymmetric folds associated with movement along the Abanda fault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S₃</td>
<td>Composite S-C mylonitic fabric indicating oblique dextral-normal movement along the Abanda and Alexander City shears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L₃</td>
<td>Mineral lineation within the LICG, constraining timing of movement on BSZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D₄</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brittle reactivation of the Alexander City fault and BSZ (Late Carboniferous to Jurassic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Middle Ordovician (Taconic) metamorphism recently has been documented in the Dadeville Complex (VanDervoort et al., 2015), although associated structures and fabrics are cryptic. Structures and fabrics observed in the Dadeville Complex within the Roanoke East Quadrangle did not reveal any new observations to identify pre-D₁ (Taconian) effects.
Figure 18: Lower hemisphere stereographic projection of poles (contoured) to $S_0/S_1$ foliation (C-planes, small black dots, N=289). Average strike and dip of foliation (black dot 1 is the pole to this average) – N40°E, 43°SE. Black dot 2 – beta axis; plunge and bearing 46.3°, S44.3°E. Black dot 3 – Pi axis; plunge and bearing 0.3°, S46°W. Black line – best fit pi girdle; strike and dip N44°W, 89.7°NE.
The Katy Creek fault is interpreted to be a D₁ structure. Fault rocks observed along this fault within and outside of the Roanoke East quad locally show evidence for retrograde right-slip shearing. However, in other localities, the structures are cryptic and parallel the metamorphic foliation, implying early- or syn-metamorphic development (Steltenpohl et al., 1990; Grimes, 1993; Sterling, 2006; Abrahams, 2014; Poole, 2015; VanDervoort, 2015). Clear truncations of major units within the Dadeville Complex are observed at map-scales all along the Katy Creek fault. The occurrence of Taconic metamorphism in the hanging-wall Dadeville Complex, combined with a lack of Taconic effects recognized within the footwall Jacksons Gap Group, requires substantial displacement along the Katy Creek fault (VanDervoort and Steltenpohl, 2015). Studies southwest of the Roanoke East quad (Singleton and Steltenpohl, 2014; Poole, 2015) document that the Katy Creek fault juxtaposes higher-grade rocks (i.e., Dadeville Complex) atop distinctly lower-grade rocks (Jacksons Gap Group). This implies an inverted metamorphic gradient formed as a result of Neoacadian down-heating from thrust emplacement of the hot Dadeville Complex upon the cooler Jacksons Gap Group.

The second deformational event (D₂) deformed and retrograded earlier-formed mineral assemblages, fabrics, and structures under lower amphibolite- to upper greenschist-facies conditions. The alignment of retrogressive chlorite and sericite defines the S₂ foliation, with the associated L₂ lineation being defined by the preferred orientation of retrograde inequant mineral grains, and tends to be collinear with L₁. F₂ folds are typically defined as microscopic to mesoscopic, tight to open folds of S₁ that are on trend with F₁ folds, and are coincident with regional, long-wavelength macroscale synforms and antiforms (Steltenpohl et al., 1990). The shallow northeast-plunging Tallassee
synform was produced by folding during D2 deformation; the west limb is defined by the Jacksons Gap Group and rocks immediately adjacent in the eastern Blue Ridge, and the core is defined by the Dadeville Complex.

D2 shear zones contain variably developed S-C composite planar fabrics with retrograde assemblages and microstructures reflecting lower-amphibolite- to upper-greenschist facies deformational conditions. The D2 shear zones are distributed across the study area but are concentrated within the Jacksons Gap Group (Brevard shear zone). They overprint the Katy Creek fault and record early-stage movement along the Alexander City and Abanda shear zones (Table 1). S-C fabrics formed during D2 indicate a dextral, strike-slip sense of movement, with slip-lines having an average plunge and bearing of 05°, S45˚W (Figure 19).

The third deformational event (D3) is represented by prominent retrograde, lower greenschist-facies, composite S-C and S-C-C’ fabrics that indicate oblique-dextral-normal movement along the Abanda shear zone. Shear zones associated with D2 and D3 are interpreted as corresponding to an array of Alleghanian dextral strike-slip shear zones that extend from the hinterland to as far west as the Goodwater-Enitachopco fault (Steltenpohl et al., 2013). Generally, C-planes for the D2 shears are more closely spaced and the S- and C-planes have lower angles between them than do the D3 S-C planes. L3 observed within the Long Island Creek Gneiss (Licg) also is interpreted to have formed during this event, providing a maximum age of ~293 Ma for the timing of movement on the Brevard shear zone.

The final deformational event (D4) is recorded within cataclasites along the northwestern side of the Alexander City and Abanda shear zones that overprint earlier
Figure 19: Lower hemisphere stereogram of S-C pairs (black arrows) and slip-lines (black triangles) associated with the Brevard shear zone (N=15). Poles to C-planes are unornamented end of arrows (blue dots) and poles to S-planes are the tip of the arrows (red circles).
fabrics and structures. While these cataclasites were not observed to crop out within the Roanoke East Quadrangle, other workers have described them as non-foliated, very fine-to fine-grained siliceous cataclasites with thin cross-cutting quartz veins (Poole, 2015; VanDervoort and Steltenpohl, 2015). These cataclasites are interpreted as representing the supra-ductile-brittle reactivation of the Alexander City and Abanda shear zones (Steltenpohl et al., 2013). These, along with similar structures throughout the southern Appalachian orogen, are interpreted to reflect the Mesozoic rifting of Pangea (Garihan and Ranson, 1992; Garihan et al., 1993).
The Long Island Creek Gneiss (LICG) is the most continuously exposed granitic body intruding the Brevard shear zone and Eastern Blue Ridge of Alabama and Georgia. The LICG is a tabular, medium- to coarse-grained and moderately- to well-foliated and lineated titanite-epidote-biotite-quartz-feldspar granitic gneiss (Figures 20 and 21). Due to the very high feldspar content of the LICG, weathering yields a characteristic light yellow-colored soil, leading to the term “Yellow Dirt Gneiss” as it is known for exposures in Yellow Dirt, Georgia. The LICG has been mapped for nearly 150 km along strike and notably, it can be traced across the zone of most intense shearing within the Brevard shear zone. There is no apparent offset where it is crossed by the individual strands of the zone, but it is stretched roughly parallel to the Brevard zone trend. The gneiss also possesses a variably developed foliation. Both the foliation and lineation appear to be more well-developed along the perimeters of the body and less prevalent within the core, as is expected with syn-kinematic intrusions, but more detailed mapping and strain analysis is needed to further confirm this.

Crystal-plastic mylonitic textures (Figures 22 and 23) are prevalent in the unit (e.g., deformation twins, strain-related myrmekite, and asymmetric mica fish), and it clearly was intruded prior to or synchronous with Brevard zone shearing. Most all primary igneous structures that had previously existed have been erased as they were not
Figure 20: Outcrop of the LICG, looking down-dip of the well-developed foliation. Top of the photo is to the southeast (33°11′42.36″, -85°20′44.16″).

Figure 21: Outcrop of the LICG, showing dextrally folded and sheared mylonitic layers. View is to the southeast (33°11′42.36″, -85°20′44.16″).
Figure 22: Photomicrograph of the LICG under XPL, showing crystal-plastic mylonitic textures; (1) minor strain-related myrmekite, (2) asymmetric mica fish, (3) deformation twins, and (4) deeply embayed feldspar. Section is cut parallel to elongation lineation and parallel to mylonitic foliation.

Figure 23: Same view as Figure 22 (same labels), but with the gypsum plate inserted in order to enhance appearance of deformation features.
found in thin sections of the LICG, although zoned zircons and larger-than-matrix feldspar grains (phenocrysts?) likely reflect the igneous heritage. Quartz exhibits undulose extinction, lobate grain boundaries, and minor subgrain development. Bands of quartz generally contain relatively coarse-grained quartz with more curved to straight boundaries between them (see bottom areas of figures 22 and 23) indicating grain-boundary reduction recrystallization (GBRR), which contrasts sharply with retrograde “quartz ribbons” that so commonly characterize the retrograde mylonites of the Brevard zone (e.g., Grimes and Steltenpohl, 1993, and Sterling, 2006). Overall, the quartz microstructures reflect relatively high temperatures of deformation exceeding ~600°C (Simpson and Schmid, 1983; Scholz, 1988; Hirth and Tullis, 1994; Tullis, 2002; Passchier and Trouw, 2005). Feldspars exhibit tapering deformation twins, bulging recrystallization, deep embayment, and minor amounts of strain-related myrmekite. Like the quartz microstructures, feldspars have microstructures contrasting sharply with those typically observed for retrograde Brevard zone mylonites. Instead of occurring as porphyroclasts with internally deformed cores and finely recrystallized rims with distinct tails (i.e., sigma- and/or delta-type porphyroclasts), LICG feldspars stand out as larger grains set in the finer-grained matrix with little or no notable core-mantle structures indicating GBRR far exceeded rotational recrystallization, which again suggests relative high deformation temperatures that exceeded ~600°C (Tullis, 1983, 2002; Simpson and Schmid, 1983; Tullis and Yung, 1992; Passchier and Trouw, 2005). These temperatures for deformation exceed conditions associated with the Alleghanian retrograde metamorphism and mylonitization (i.e., a middle to upper greenschist-facies event; Grimes and Steltenpohl, 1993; Steltenpohl and Kunk, 1993; Sterling, 2006; Steltenpohl et
Based on the field relations and the microstructural observations supporting near- to sub-magmatic conditions of mylonitization, the current author interprets the LICG to have been emplaced under syn- to late-syn-kinematic conditions.

Despite its importance to Brevard zone evolution, surprisingly little is known about the LICG both in terms of its geochemistry and its age, so its role in the development of the southern Appalachians is not well understood. The only age reported for the LICG had been a Rb-Sr whole-rock isochron-age of ~460 Ma (Sinha and Higgins, 1987), and no published geochemical data exists on the granite. In order to characterize the magmagenesis and timing of the granite, samples of the LICG were collected from exposures within both Alabama and Georgia for geochemical and geochronological studies.

**Geochronology**

One sample (RRE-15) of the LICG from the Roanoke East, Alabama, Quadrangle was selected for geochronological analysis of zircons using U-Pb age-dating methods. The sample location can be seen in Figures 24 and 25, and in Appendix I. The outcrop from which RRE-15 was collected was located in a roadside hill (both sides of the road) just north of White Crossroads. Strike and dip of the foliation at this location is N45˚E, 60˚SE. The sample selected was the most ideal compared to other outcrop locations of the LICG within the quadrangle due to the lesser degree of deformation observed and the pristine quality (‘freshness’) of the rock, both crucial to obtaining zircons ideal for dating the timing of magmatic crystallization.

Initial zircon separation took place at Columbus State University under the
Figure 2: Geologic map of the Roanoke East, Alabama Quadrangle. Triangles represent geochemical sample locations; the black circle denotes the sample location for geochronological analyses.
Figure 25: Detailed geologic map along the BSZ from Alabama to north of Atlanta by Crawford and Kath (2015). The location of the Roanoke East, Alabama, Quadrangle is outlined by the red box. The LICG is indicated by the brown, roughly tabular unit. Sample locations for geochemical analyses by Dr. Karen Tefend are denoted by blue squares; note that multiple samples were collected at some locations.
supervision of Dr. Clint Barineau. The sample was first crushed using a jaw crusher, and was then put through a 500 micron sieve. The portion of sample < 500 microns was passed through a spiral panner in order to initially separate lighter materials (including fine dust) from the heavier, denser materials. The ‘heavies’ were passed through a Frantz magnetic separator to remove as much magnetic material as possible. Heavy (high density) liquid separation occurred at Auburn University under the supervision of Dr. Mark Steltenpohl. Portions of the non-magnetic sample were processed using methylene iodide (MEI; density of 3.32 g/cm³) in order to separate zircon from all other materials (including apatite) until all of the sample was processed. Zircons were hand-picked under a high power microscope and sent to Dr. Joshua Schwartz at California State University, Northridge for mounting, imaging and final analysis using LA-SF-ICP-MS methods. All data were plotted using Isoplot 3.75 (Ludwig, 2012).

The final results, including standards that were analyzed, are indicated in Appendix I. Individual zircons were labeled on the basis of their morphology (anhedral or euhedral). A relative probability plot of all analyses can be seen in Figure 26, displaying a prominent peak at ~290 Ma and minor peaks at ~400-500 Ma, ~600 Ma, and ~1000 Ma. A weighted average of all analyses <400 Ma (25 out of 32 analyzed zircons) was calculated, yielding an age of 293.1 ± 5.3 Ma (Figure 27). A Terra-Wasserburg diagram of the more pristine, euhedral zircons (Figure 28) yields an intercept age at 291.0 ± 5.5 Ma, which is consistent with the weighted average seen in Figure 27; discordance is attributed to the presence of older, inherited zircons. Originally the author sought to explore the hypothesis that the LICG is potentially related to the Ordovician Zana and
Figure 26: Relative probability plot of all U-Pb analyses of zircons from the LICG.
Figure 27: Weighted average of all zircon U-Pb analyses <400 Ma (25 out of 32 analyzed zircons), yielding an age of 293.1 +/- 5.3 Ma.
Figure 28: Terra-Wasserburg diagram of more pristine, euhedral zircons of the LICG, yielding intercept age at 291.0 +/- 5.5 Ma which is consistent with the weighted average in Figure 27.
Kowaliga gneisses, but an age of 293.1 ± 5.3 Ma on the LICG is too young to allow the intrusives to be temporally related.

**Geochemistry**

Six samples of the LICG from the Roanoke East, Alabama, Quadrangle were selected for whole rock and trace element geochemical analyses. All samples occur within the BSZ, with locations indicated in Figures 24 and 25, and Appendix I. Samples weighing approximately 30 grams were sent to Activation Laboratories Ltd. (Ontario, Canada) for commercial analysis using a combination of ICP-MS (inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry) and INAA (instrumental neutron activation analysis) methods. Results are tabulated in Appendix III. In addition to these analyses, Dr. Karen Tefend (University of West Georgia) provided whole rock analyses of nine samples from the LICG northwest of metro-Atlanta (locations seen in Figure 25) based on XRF (X-ray fluorescence) methods. Results are reported in Appendix IV. From this point forward, samples collected by Dr. Tefend near Atlanta will be referred to as the Georgia LICG. These data were then plotted against previously reported data on the Zana gneiss and Kowaliga gneiss (Stoddard, 1983 and Hawkins, 2013) in order to evaluate any potential relationships between the intrusive bodies.

CIPW normative mineral assemblages were calculated for all samples and plotted on an An-Ab-Or tonalite to granite classification ternary diagram (after Barker, 1979) in Figure 29. All samples of the Alabama LICG plot as true granites, while the Georgia LICG samples follow a more tonalitic to granitic trend. Plotted on an AFM ternary diagram (after Irvine and Baragar, 1971), the LICG follows a calc-alkaline trend along
Figure 29: CIPW normative classification for samples of the LICG after Barker (1979).
with the data previously reported on the Zana and Kowaliga gneisses (Figure 30). Harker bivariate plots of eight major oxides (Al$_2$O$_3$, CaO, FeO, MgO, Na$_2$O, TiO$_2$, K$_2$O, and P$_2$O$_5$) versus silica are reported in Figure 31. In all of these Harker plots, the LICG plots dominantly at the higher end of the silica trend (> 65% SiO$_2$), particularly those samples from Alabama. The current author interprets that the LICG, at least partially, represents an intrusion that cooled from a highly fractionated melt, resulting in the high silica content that is observed. In all these plots (Figures 29, 30, and 31), the LICG data partly overlaps those previously reported on the Zana and Kowaliga gneisses, however it is important to note that this does not require their correlation if the intrusions are of different ages.

Trace element data on the Alabama LICG and the Kowaliga gneiss (Hawkins, 2013) are plotted using various tectonic discrimination schemes in an effort to constrain a tectonic setting for the LICG. Figure 32 contains Rb-(Yb+Nb) and Rb-(Yb-Ta) plots (after Pearce et al., 1984) showing the LICG predominantly as a within-plate granite and the Kowaliga gneiss as a volcanic-arc granite, with minor overlap between the two. Figure 33 is a Hf-Rb/30-Ta x 3 tectonic discrimination ternary scheme after Harris et al. (1986), and shows the LICG as a volcanic-arc granite with some data lying in the syn-collisional granite field. The Kowaliga gneiss appears to lie within almost every field on the ternary scheme. Due to the conflicting nature of these diagrams (Figures 32 and 33) and the mobile nature of Rb, any insight gained from them based on the currently available data is inconclusive.
Figure 30: AFM ternary diagram for LICG samples after Irvine and Baragar (1971).
Figure 31: Harker bivariate plots of eight major oxides from the LICG.
Figure 32: Rb-(Y+Nb) and Rb-(Yb+Ta) tectonic discrimination plots for the LICG after Pearce et al. (1984).
Figure 33: Hf-Rb/30-Ta x 3 tectonic discrimination ternary diagram for LICG and Kowaliga Gneiss (Hawkins, 2013) after Harris et al. (1986).
DISCUSSION

The author originally proposed to explore the hypothetical relationship of the LICG to various Ordovician intrusives in the region (i.e., Zana and Kowaliga gneisses), which may have had implications regarding the relationship of the EBR to the JGG that defines the BSZ. Geochronologic analyses, however, yielded a surprisingly young age of 293.1 +/- 5.3 Ma, making it far too young to be related to the Zana or Kowaliga gneisses. Muscovite cooling ages on rocks encapsulating the LICG (i.e., EBR, JGG, and IP lithologies) yield an early to middle Pennsylvanian (Alleghanian) mean age of ~317.5 Ma, and they are interpreted to record timing of cooling through the ~350 °C isotherm following the latest metamorphic event (Poole, 2015). While some zircon analyses in this study exhibited low Th/U ratios (<0.1), the current author does not interpret these to be related to metamorphism. Several authors have noted that lower Th/U ratios can be produced in zircons within igneous rocks that cooled from a highly fractionated source (Kirkland et al., 2015), and based on its geochemistry, the LICG is highly fractionated. The current author thus interprets that the ~293 Ma age on the LICG reflects emplacement and igneous crystallization, and not metamorphism. There are other granitic Alleghanian plutons intruding the region with similar ages (Lin, 2015), suggesting that perhaps the LICG was produced from a related magmatic event.

An initial issue of concern was whether the LICG is an orthogneiss (igneous protolith) or a paragneiss (sedimentary protolith). This was questioned given the minor
age population peaks (~450, 600, and 1000 Ma) seen in Figure 26. Igneous structures/features are rarely observed in thin sections of all the LICG samples. Instead, mainly microstructures indicative of solid-state deformation related to movement on the BSZ were observed. The analyzed zircons do exhibit oscillatory zoning however, which is characteristic of magmatic zircons. In addition, an intrusive origin for the LICG protolith is further confirmed by discriminant functions calculated for all LICG geochemical analyses, which yield a positive value indicative of an igneous protolith (Shaw, 1972; calculations in Appendix V). Geochemical analyses, particularly those on samples in Alabama, reveal that the LICG is a granite that was cooled from a highly fractionated melt, thus resulting in the occurrence of some lower Th/U ratios. The minor age population peaks in Figure 26, thus, likely reflect xenocrystic components incorporated during the ascent of the fractionated LICG melt through the crust, as crustal components of each of those age ranges are known to host rocks cut by the Brevard shear zone (VanDervoort, 2015).

The ~293 Ma age for magmatic crystallization of the LICG makes it among the youngest granitic intrusions yet dated from the Alabama Piedmont. It falls at the tail end of the latest period of Alleghanian plutonism that spanned a period of time between ~330 and 295 Ma (Lin, 2015). The LICG orthogneiss-sheet parallels the Brevard shear zone for more than 150 km northeastward into the area near Atlanta, Georgia where the more bulbous sigmoidal-shaped and similarly late-Alleghanian-aged Ben Hill and Palmetto granites (Lin, 2015) have been dextrally-dragged into the Brevard zone (Vauchez, 1987). The intense mylonitic fabric and microstructures of the LICG document syn- to late-syn-magmatic crystallization shearing, which places a maximum on the time of right-slip
movement along the Brevard shear zone at ca. 293 Ma. This timing is compatible with movement along the southern Appalachian decollement and the system of Alleghanian dextral shear zones that lace the southernmost parts of the Appalachians (Secor et al., 1986; Steltenpohl, 1988; Steltenpohl et al., 1992, 2013).
CONCLUSIONS

1. The lithologies of the Jacksons Gap Group within the Roanoke East Quadrangle are not easily divided into separate, mappable units as a result of their gradational nature and similarity to adjacent units (i.e., Emuckfaw Group and Waresville Schist). This paucity of distinct mappable units (e.g., orthoquartzites, metaconglomerates, and graphite quartzites), also reported from the Wadley South Quadrangle (VanDervoort, 2015), contrasts sharply with observations further to the southwest and is perhaps a result of along-strike structural and/or stratigraphic variations (e.g., Sterling, 2006; Hawkins, 2013; Abrahams, 2014; and Poole, 2015). Thus, within the Roanoke East Quadrangle, lithologies of the Jacksons Gap Group are divided into two main lithofacies types: a structurally lower section defined mostly by garnetiferous-graphitic-quartz-biotite schists and phyllites interlayered with micaceous quartzites, and an upper section of variably graphitic, garnetiferous-sericite-chlorite schists and phyllites, with no interlayered quartzites. These lithologies are intruded by the Long Island Creek Gneiss.

2. The metapelitic lithologies of the Jacksons Gap Group within the Roanoke East Quadrangle are not easily distinguishable from some lithologies of the immediately adjacent units of the Emuckfaw Group and the structurally lower parts of the Waresville Schist. Particularly problematic are the garnetiferous-
graphitic-quartz-biotite schists at the structural bottom of the Jacksons Gap Group and the variably graphitic-garnetiferous-sericite-chlorite schists within the upper Jacksons Gap Group. Combined with the current author’s lack of finding cataclasites marking faults bounding the Brevard shear zone, placing the upper and lower contacts of the Brevard shear zone proved to be a difficult task.

3. The current author defines the upper limit of the Emuckfaw Group within the Roanoke East Quadrangle based on the lack of metagraywackes and rare, thin amphibolites. The lower limit of the Waresville Schist is based on the occurrence of amphibolites, interpreting them to be part of the metavolcanics of the Dadeville Complex. This contrasts with the work done by Kath (personal communication to M.G. Steltenpohl, 2016), where these same amphibolites are placed within the Brevard shear zone between the Abanda and Katy Creek faults, making their Brevard shear zone significantly thicker than the current author suggests.

4. The Long Island Creek Gneiss does not cross over the boundaries of the Brevard shear zone within the Roanoke East quadrangle, but appears to do so in areas outside of the current study area based on previous maps (Alabama and Georgia state geologic maps; i.e., Osborne et al., 1988 and Pickering, 1976, respectively). The current author suggests that the Long Island Creek Gneiss intrudes the Jacksons Gap Group lithologies, and is stretched/sheared along the Brevard zone shears, particularly the Katy Creek fault within the Roanoke East Quadrangle.
5. Dadeville Complex lithologic units and their associated early-metamorphic fabrics (Taconian?) are truncated along the syn- to late-D1 Katy Creek fault, which later was overprinted by D2 and D3 retrograde dextral shearing. An inverted metamorphic gradient appears to correspond to the Katy Creek fault, which may have been formed as a result of down-heating that occurred during the emplacement of the hot Dadeville Complex on top of the cooler Jacksons Gap Group. The amalgamation of the Jacksons Gap Group and the Dadeville Complex occurred no earlier than the Acadian, as evidence for Taconic metamorphism in the hanging wall (VanDervoort et al., 2015) is lacking in the footwall units.

6. The age of Rock Mills Granite Gneiss remains to be constrained. The current author suggests, however, that it must be younger than the 466 Ma Waresville Schist that it intrudes (VanDervoort et al., 2015).

7. The Long Island Creek Gneiss was emplaced at 293.1 +/- 5.3 Ma representing a later, more highly fractionated melt that cooled at the end of the period of Alleghanian plutonism which spanned a period of time between ~330 and 295 Ma (Lin, 2015). Combined with field and microstructural observations, the ~293 Ma date places a maximum on the timing of dextral movement along the Brevard shear zone.
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## Appendix I. Sample list of Long Island Creek Gneiss sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Location (WGS 84)</th>
<th>AL/GA</th>
<th>Collector*</th>
<th>Geochemistry</th>
<th>Geochronology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RRE-15</td>
<td>33.1993°N, -85.3418°W</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>RPH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRE-31</td>
<td>33.2156°N, -85.3099°W</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>RPH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRE-32B</td>
<td>33.2156°N, -85.3089°W</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>RPH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRE-110</td>
<td>33.2218°N, -85.2918°W</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>RPH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRE-149</td>
<td>33.1856°N, -85.3590°W</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>RPH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRE-18</td>
<td>33.1899°N, -85.3499°W</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>RPH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>KST</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>KST</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>KST</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>KST</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>KST</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* RPH is the author of this thesis and KST is Dr. Karen Tefend (University of West Georgia).
## Appendix II. LA-SF-ICP-MS Analyses of Zircons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>(n=15)</th>
<th>U (ppm)</th>
<th>Th (ppm)</th>
<th>(^{238}\text{Th}/^{238}\text{U})</th>
<th>(^{206}\text{Pb}/^{208}\text{Pb}) ((%) err)</th>
<th>(^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}) ((%) err)</th>
<th>(^{206}\text{Pb}/^{238}\text{U}) ((%) err)</th>
<th>Ages (Ma)</th>
<th>(^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}) abs err</th>
<th>(^{206}\text{Pb}/^{238}\text{U}) abs err</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anhe_1_6_1</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>19.685</td>
<td>7.09%</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>4.18%</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>309.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhe_1_6_2</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>20.661</td>
<td>6.61%</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>4.93%</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>294.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhe_1_6_3</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>18.051</td>
<td>7.76%</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>7.26%</td>
<td>1790</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>322.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhe_1_6_4</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>18.484</td>
<td>7.39%</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>10.24%</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>309.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhe_1_6_5</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>20.833</td>
<td>7.29%</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>5.11%</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>294.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhe_1_6_6</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>20.000</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>4.27%</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>306.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhe_1_6_7</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>19.724</td>
<td>6.51%</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>4.05%</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>306.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhe_1_6_8</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.230</td>
<td>12.821</td>
<td>6.54%</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>5.38%</td>
<td>2076</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>484.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhe_1_6_9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.383</td>
<td>13.333</td>
<td>5.73%</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>5.29%</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>469.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhe_1_6_10</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.198</td>
<td>14.620</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>4.34%</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>426.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhe_1_6_11</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>17.391</td>
<td>5.91%</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>5.38%</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>345.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhe_1_6_12</td>
<td>3,690</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>18.083</td>
<td>6.87%</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>5.81%</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>336.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhe_1_6_13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>5.992</td>
<td>5.57%</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>994.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhe_1_6_14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>5.889</td>
<td>5.71%</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1010.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhe_1_6_15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td>5.875</td>
<td>5.58%</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1013.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix II. (continued)

### LA-SF-ICP-MS analyses of zircons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>U (ppm)</th>
<th>Th (ppm)</th>
<th>$^{232}$Th/$^{238}$U</th>
<th>$^{208}$U/$^{206}$Pb (± err)</th>
<th>$^{207}$Pb/$^{206}$Pb (± err)</th>
<th>$^{206}$Pb/$^{207}$Pb (± err)</th>
<th>Ages (Ma)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Euhe_1_to_7_1</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>20.5339 6.78% 0.084</td>
<td>5.47%</td>
<td>1266 110</td>
<td>294.71 19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euhe_1_to_7_2</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>20.5761 6.58% 0.081</td>
<td>4.71%</td>
<td>1216 94</td>
<td>295.42 19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euhe_1_to_7_3</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>21.6920 7.38% 0.098</td>
<td>7.22%</td>
<td>1560 130</td>
<td>274.15 20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euhe_1_to_7_4</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>22.1729 6.65% 0.065</td>
<td>4.33%</td>
<td>752 89</td>
<td>279.95 18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euhe_1_to_7_5</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>22.2222 7.11% 0.077</td>
<td>4.97%</td>
<td>1108 110</td>
<td>275.25 19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euhe_1_to_7_6</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>21.9780 6.81% 0.072</td>
<td>3.88%</td>
<td>985 80</td>
<td>279.77 18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euhe_1_to_7_7</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>20.7039 7.04% 0.083</td>
<td>4.82%</td>
<td>1279 92</td>
<td>292.73 20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euhe_1_to_7_8</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>13.31</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>16.0514 7.70% 0.259</td>
<td>4.64%</td>
<td>3240 78</td>
<td>292.25 24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euhe_1_to_7_9</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>22.3714 8.05% 0.086</td>
<td>4.64%</td>
<td>1341 94</td>
<td>270.10 21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euhe_1_to_7_10</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>19.8413 7.54% 0.084</td>
<td>5.22%</td>
<td>1276 98</td>
<td>304.76 27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euhe_1_to_7_11</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>18.69</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>19.9203 7.37% 0.096</td>
<td>6.91%</td>
<td>1520 120</td>
<td>299.25 21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euhe_1_to_7_12</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>10.4058 7.60% 0.517</td>
<td>5.61%</td>
<td>4289 81</td>
<td>591.00 43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euhe_1_to_7_13</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>18.0180 6.67% 0.199</td>
<td>5.04%</td>
<td>2800 90</td>
<td>286.46 19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euhe_1_to_7_14</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>18.7970 6.02% 0.159</td>
<td>8.18%</td>
<td>2420 130</td>
<td>290.92 18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euhe_1_to_7_15</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19.7628 6.13% 0.101</td>
<td>5.27%</td>
<td>1612 97</td>
<td>299.62 18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euhe_1_to_7_16</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>20.8768 6.05% 0.077</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
<td>1113 85</td>
<td>292.62 17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euhe_1_to_7_17</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>15.8228 7.91% 0.286</td>
<td>14.69%</td>
<td>3100 280</td>
<td>283.10 31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euhe_1_to_7_18</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>14.4300 5.63% 0.067</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>807 110</td>
<td>431.90 24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>Sample (n=19)</td>
<td>U (ppm)</td>
<td>Th (ppm)</td>
<td>$^{232}\text{Th}/^{238}\text{U}$</td>
<td>$^{238}\text{U}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ (%) err</td>
<td>$^{207}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ (%) err</td>
<td>$^{208}\text{Pb}/^{206}\text{Pb}$ (%) err</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ou49127_1</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>46.4900</td>
<td>6.04%</td>
<td>0.0501</td>
<td>4.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ou49127_2</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>46.6418</td>
<td>6.53%</td>
<td>0.0482</td>
<td>4.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ou49127_3</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>45.9982</td>
<td>5.52%</td>
<td>0.0555</td>
<td>4.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ou49127_4</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>45.5789</td>
<td>6.84%</td>
<td>0.0668</td>
<td>9.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ou49127_5</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>44.9438</td>
<td>6.29%</td>
<td>0.0571</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ou49127_6</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>44.6628</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>0.0627</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z_Plesovice_1</td>
<td>10,150</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>16.9492</td>
<td>8.14%</td>
<td>0.0559</td>
<td>6.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z_Plesovice_2</td>
<td>20,900</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>18.4843</td>
<td>9.80%</td>
<td>0.0541</td>
<td>6.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z_Plesovice_3</td>
<td>15,140</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>17.6678</td>
<td>6.54%</td>
<td>0.0549</td>
<td>4.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z_Plesovice_4</td>
<td>12,100</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>20.6186</td>
<td>8.25%</td>
<td>0.0535</td>
<td>5.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z_Plesovice_5</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>18.6220</td>
<td>6.33%</td>
<td>0.0556</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z_91500_1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>5.7471</td>
<td>6.32%</td>
<td>0.0752</td>
<td>5.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z_91500_2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>5.5127</td>
<td>7.17%</td>
<td>0.0753</td>
<td>5.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z_91500_3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>5.5525</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>0.0747</td>
<td>5.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z_91500_4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>5.5371</td>
<td>4.98%</td>
<td>0.0750</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z_91500_5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>5.4259</td>
<td>4.77%</td>
<td>0.0740</td>
<td>4.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z_91500_6</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>5.8445</td>
<td>7.01%</td>
<td>0.0740</td>
<td>4.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z_91500_7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>5.5991</td>
<td>7.28%</td>
<td>0.0765</td>
<td>3.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z_91500_8</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>5.5310</td>
<td>5.53%</td>
<td>0.0740</td>
<td>3.78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix II. (continued) LA-SF-ICP-MS analyses of zircons.
Appendix III. Geochemical analyses of the Alabama LICG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SiO₂</th>
<th>Al₂O₃</th>
<th>Fe₂O₃</th>
<th>MnO</th>
<th>MgO</th>
<th>CaO</th>
<th>Na₂O</th>
<th>K₂O</th>
<th>TiO₂</th>
<th>P₂O₅</th>
<th>P₂O₆</th>
<th>SO₃</th>
<th>TiO₂</th>
<th>LOI</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Ag</th>
<th>Al</th>
<th>As</th>
<th>Ba</th>
<th>Be</th>
<th>Bl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRE-15</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>75.19</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRE-31</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>77.72</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>100.3</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRE-32B</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>77.75</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRE-110</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>77.51</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRE-149</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>76.69</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRE-18</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>76.56</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| g     | ppm  | %     | %    | %    | %    | %    | %    | %    | %    | %    | %    | %    | %    | %    | %    | %    | %  | %  | %  | %  | %  | %  |
|-------|------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| RRE-15 | <0.1 | 0.68 | 0.17 | 0.14 | 0.26 | 2.39 | 26.4 | 6.9 | 3.9 | 0.8 | 1.23 | 15.8 | 7.6 | <0.1 | 1.4 | <10 | 3 | 10 | 14 | 0.1 |
| RRE-31 | <0.1 | 0.4 | 0.16 | 0.10 | 0.24 | 2.23 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 10.4 | 1.8 | 36.7 | <0.1 | 1.9 | <10 | 5.8 | <0.1 |
| RRE-32B | <0.1 | 0.35 | 0.10 | 0.13 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.46 | 1.84 | 3.3 | 0.137 | 18.1 | 40.4 | <0.1 | 0.1 | 0.15 | <10 | 6.8 | <0.1 |
| RRE-110 | <0.1 | 0.22 | 0.1 | 0.15 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.46 | 1.84 | 3.3 | 0.137 | 18.1 | 40.4 | <0.1 | 0.1 | 0.15 | <10 | 6.8 | <0.1 |
| RRE-149 | <0.1 | 0.43 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.94 | 0.22 | 16.8 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.11 | 1.9 | 7.3 | 0.2 | 3.6 | <10 | 2 | <10 |
| FRE-18 | <0.1 | 0.38 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 1.02 | 1.9 | 6.4 | 4.9 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 4.9 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 1.9 | 6.4 | 4.9 | 0.2 | 1.1 |

78
| Mass   | Sr   | Zr   | Nb   | Yb   | Hf   | Ta   | Zn   | Y   | W   | Sc   | Se   | Sm   | Sr   | Tb   | Te   | Th   | Ti   | Tm   | U    | V    | Yb   | Zn   | Zr   | Yb   | Zr   |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| g      | g    | g    | g    | g    | g    | g    | g    | g   | g   | g    | g    | g    | g    | g    | g    | g    | g    | g    | g    | g    | g    | g    | g    | g    |
| ppm   | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm | ppm | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  |
| 3.5    | 3.9  | 5.9  | 2.2  | 2.1  | 2.4  | 1.9  | 2.15| 3.1 | 3.1 | 4.6 | 2.6 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 4.2 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 4.2 | 3.6 | 4.2  | 3.6 |
| ppm   | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm | ppm | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  |
| 31.3  | 31.3 | 31.3 | 31.3 | 30.4 | 30.4 | 30.2 | 32.6 | 31.5 | 31.5 | 31.3 | 31.3 | 31.3 | 31.3 | 31.3 | 31.3 | 31.3 | 31.3 | 31.3 | 31.3 | 31.3 | 31.3 | 31.3 | 31.3 |
| ppm   | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm | ppm | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  | ppm  |
| 79 |
Appendix IV. Geochemical analyses of the Georgia LICG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SiO₂</th>
<th>Al₂O₃</th>
<th>Fe₂O₃</th>
<th>MnO</th>
<th>MgO</th>
<th>CaO</th>
<th>Na₂O</th>
<th>K₂O</th>
<th>TiO₂</th>
<th>P₂O₅</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>67.086</td>
<td>15.085</td>
<td>4.7039</td>
<td>0.0591</td>
<td>1.6427</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>4.389</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.5572</td>
<td>0.1338</td>
<td>98.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>68.369</td>
<td>16.801</td>
<td>4.2606</td>
<td>0.0739</td>
<td>1.7392</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4.7934</td>
<td>2.1546</td>
<td>0.5773</td>
<td>0.1224</td>
<td>102.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>75.172</td>
<td>15.448</td>
<td>2.5172</td>
<td>0.0609</td>
<td>0.5741</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>4.5993</td>
<td>3.5319</td>
<td>0.2671</td>
<td>0.0738</td>
<td>104.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>75.942</td>
<td>13.275</td>
<td>2.2092</td>
<td>0.0682</td>
<td>0.5512</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>3.8228</td>
<td>3.4066</td>
<td>0.2313</td>
<td>0.0046</td>
<td>100.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>67.856</td>
<td>15.618</td>
<td>4.6524</td>
<td>0.0656</td>
<td>1.5505</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>4.4618</td>
<td>1.9529</td>
<td>0.5101</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>70.209</td>
<td>16.401</td>
<td>2.9138</td>
<td>0.0522</td>
<td>1.5432</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>4.7637</td>
<td>1.8161</td>
<td>0.4773</td>
<td>0.1242</td>
<td>101.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>70.166</td>
<td>15.875</td>
<td>3.9146</td>
<td>0.0602</td>
<td>1.5313</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>4.3863</td>
<td>2.2675</td>
<td>0.4837</td>
<td>0.0849</td>
<td>102.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>77.653</td>
<td>14.832</td>
<td>1.8264</td>
<td>0.0292</td>
<td>0.6126</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>4.5858</td>
<td>1.9669</td>
<td>0.2126</td>
<td>0.0284</td>
<td>104.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>70.551</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>4.6524</td>
<td>0.0648</td>
<td>1.5339</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>4.2461</td>
<td>1.9789</td>
<td>0.5732</td>
<td>0.1389</td>
<td>102.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>SiO$_2$</td>
<td>FeO</td>
<td>MgO</td>
<td>CaO</td>
<td>Na$_2$O</td>
<td>K$_2$O</td>
<td>0.21 SiO$_2$</td>
<td>0.32 FeO</td>
<td>0.98 MgO</td>
<td>0.55 CaO</td>
<td>1.46 Na$_2$O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRE-15</td>
<td>75.19</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRE-31</td>
<td>76.92</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>16.15</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRE-32B</td>
<td>77.15</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRE-110</td>
<td>77.51</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>16.28</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRE-149</td>
<td>76.69</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRE-18</td>
<td>76.56</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>16.08</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>67.09</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>14.09</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>68.37</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>14.36</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>75.17</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>6.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>75.94</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>15.95</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>67.86</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>6.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>70.21</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>70.17</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>77.65</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>16.31</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>70.55</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>14.82</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Discriminant function calculated by $DF = 30.44 \cdot (0.21 \cdot \text{SiO}_2) - (0.32 \cdot \text{FeO}) - (0.98 \cdot \text{MgO}) + (0.55 \cdot \text{CaO}) + (1.45 \cdot \text{Na}_2\text{O}) + (0.54 \cdot \text{K}_2\text{O})$. See Shaw (1972) for more details.
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LEGEND

Lithologic Units

Inner Piedmont
Dadeville Complex

- **Idrm** Rock Mills Granite Gneiss
  - Well-foliated, medium- to coarse-grained granitic gneiss containing biotite, muscovite, quartz, potassium feldspar, and varying minor amounts of epidote and garnet.
  - Interlayered felsic and mafic schists. Felsic schists are fine- to medium-grained and contain varying amounts of quartz, plagioclase, potassium feldspar, sericite, and minor pyrite. Mafic layers comprise amphibole-bearing schist and thinly banded to massive amphibolite. Locally, muscovite schists with opaques are interlayered with the felsic and mafic schists.

- **Idws** Waresville Schist
  - Medium- to coarse-grained, moderately- to well-foliated epidote-muscovite-biotite-quartz-feldspar-gneissic granite. Intrudes the units of the Jacksons Gap Group. Tectonostratigraphic position not understood.

Inner Piedmont
Jacksons Gap Group

- **Licg** Long Island Creek Gneiss
  - Medium- to coarse-grained, well-foliated, locally graphitic phylmites that contain varying amounts of muscovite, sericite, chlorite, quartz, and garnet. Locally interlayered with garnetiferous schists similar to those within JGgqs.

- **JGscp** Sericite-Chlorite Phyllite
  - Fine- to medium-grained, well-foliated, micaeous quartzite containing varying amounts of muscovite, biotite, sericite, quartz, and feldspar.

- **JGgqs** Garnetiferous Quartz Schist
  - Locally graphitic, fine- to medium-grained garnet-quartz-biotite-sericite schist.

- **JGmq** Micaceous Schist
  - Fine- to medium-grained, well-foliated, garnetiferous muscovite-biotite-quartz-feldspar schist, fine-grained muscovite-biotite-quartz-feldspar metawacke, and thin (<0.5 m), rare fine-grained banded amphibolite.

- **Abanda Shear Zone**
  - medium- to coarse-grained augen gneiss containing quartz, potassium feldspar, plagioclase, biotite, and muscovite. Undifferentiated package of locally graphitic and garnetiferous muscovite-biotite-quartz-feldspar schist, fine-grained muscovite-biotite-quartz-feldspar metawacke, and thin (<0.5 m), rare fine-grained banded amphibolite.

- **Eastern Blue Ridge**
  - Wedowee Group
  - **Ekg** Kowaliga Gneiss
    - Well-foliated, medium-grained, fine- to medium-grained, well-foliated epidote-muscovite-biotite-quartz-feldspar gneiss.
  - **Eem** Emuckfaw Group
    - Medium- to coarse-grained augen gneiss containing quartz, potassium feldspar, plagioclase, biotite, and muscovite. Undifferentiated package of locally graphitic and garnetiferous muscovite-biotite-quartz-feldspar schist, fine-grained muscovite-biotite-quartz-feldspar metawacke, and thin (<0.5 m), rare fine-grained banded amphibolite.

- **Alexander City Shear Zone**
  - Wedowee Group
  - **Ewe** Wedowee Group
    - Graphitic garnetiferous muscovite-biotite-quartz-feldspar schist interlayered with banded to massive amphibolite.

Structural Symbols

- **Contact**
- **Fault/Shear Zone**
- **Dextral Strike-Slip Movement**
- **S<sub>1</sub>/S<sub>2</sub> Metamorphic Foliation**