

DESCRIPTION OF MAP UNITS

QUATERNARY
Alluvial deposits
Qal₁ Stream alluvium (upper Holocene) – Stratified, moderately to well-sorted clay, silt, sand, and gravel deposits in large, active drainages; mapped along Johnson Wash and its major tributaries; includes alluvial fans and colluvial deposits and small alluvial deposits; and alluvial terrace deposits as much as 10 feet (3 m) above modern channels; 0 to 30 feet (0–9 m) thick.

Artificial deposits
Qf Artificial fill (Historical) – Artificial fill used to create small dams; consists of engineered fill and general borrow material; although only a few deposits have been mapped, fill should be anticipated in all areas with human impact, many of which are shown on the topographic base map; 0 to 20 feet (0–6 m) thick.

Eolian deposits
Qes Eolian sand (Holocene to upper Pleistocene) – Well- to very well sorted, very fine to medium-grained, well-rounded, mostly quartz sand derived principally from the Navajo Sandstone; commonly deposited in irregular hummocky mounds on the lee side of ridges, primarily on gentle slopes of the Lamb Point Tongue of the Navajo Sandstone and the dip slope of the Shinarump Conglomerate Member of the Chinle Formation, but also deposited on the main body of the Kayenta Formation and on mixed alluvial and eolian (Qac) deposits where side canyons widen near Johnson Canyon; 0 to 20 feet (0–6 m) thick.

Mass-movement deposits
Qmt Talus (Holocene to upper Pleistocene) – Very poorly sorted, angular boulders with minor fine-grained interstitial sediment; deposited mostly by rock fall on and at the base of steep slopes; forms primarily from blocks that break off from the Navajo Sandstone and Kayenta Formation and come to rest on the more gentle slope of the Moenave Formation, and from blocks of the Shinarump Conglomerate Member of the Chinle Formation that come to rest on the slope of the Moenkopi Formation; locally contains small landslide deposits; locally includes and is gradational with eolian, mixed alluvial and eolian pediment-mantle deposits (Qape) further downslope; mantles slopes beneath cliffs and ledges; 0 to 20 feet (0–6 m) thick.

Mixed-environment deposits
Qac Alluvial and eolian deposits (Holocene) – Poorly to moderately sorted, clay- to boulder-sized, locally derived sediment deposited in swales and minor active drainages by clay-, slope-wash, and creep processes; gradational with stream alluvium (Qal), mixed alluvial and eolian pediment-mantle deposits (Qape), and mixed alluvial and eolian deposits (Qae); 0 to 30 feet (0–9 m) thick.

Qae Alluvial and eolian deposits (Holocene to upper Pleistocene) – Moderately to well-sorted, clay- to sand-sized alluvial sediment that locally includes abundant eolian sand and minor alluvial gravel; includes alluvial fan deposits too small to map separately in the upper part; calcic soils exhibit stage II pedogenic carbonate development (after Birkeland and others, 1991); upper reaches that are not deeply incised accumulate sediment, but middle and lower reaches are deeply incised by Johnson Wash creating an arroyo; forms broad, sloping surfaces in Johnson Canyon and its tributaries, and in other drainages coming off the Vermilion Cliffs; 0 to 30 feet (0–9 m) exposed thickness.

Qae The Johnson Lakes quadrangle is characterized by large arroyo valleys with thick alluvial fill. Several studies have documented that throughout the geologic record, arroyos of the southwest (and streams in other climates as well) cycle between episodes of incision and bank-filling. Well-documented entrenchment in this part of southwest Utah began in 1882 during a series of large floods and continued until 1910, thus exposing older depositional phases (Smith, 1990; Webb and others, 1991; Summa, 2009; Nelson and Rittenour, 2011; see also Herford, 2002). Six samples taken from incised walls of Kanab Creek, in a similar depositional setting about 10 miles (16 km) to the west of the Johnson Lakes quadrangle, yielded radiocarbon ages that ranged from 534 ± 90 °C yr B.P. (5934–6291 cal yr B.P.) to 570 ± 70 °C yr B.P. (588–664 cal yr B.P.) (Smith, 1990), whereas optically stimulated luminescence (OSL) ages obtained from two samples are much older—8580 ± 510 yr B.P. and 11,240 ± 840 yr B.P.—suggesting prior cutting and filling events (Summa, 2009; Nelson and Rittenour, 2011; see also Hayden, 2011a). Also along Kanab Creek, tree-ring evidence substantiates an increase in precipitation intensity, suggesting that a short-term fluctuation in climate is the principal cause for arroyo initiation. In some cases, this may be exacerbated by poor land-use practices that increased runoff (Webb and others, 1991); however, at least three arroyos were cut and back-filled along Kanab Creek in the past 5200 years in the absence of modern agriculture, irrigation, and grazing practices (Webb and others, 1991). About 10 to 15 miles (16–24 km) east of the Johnson Lakes quadrangle at Park Wash and Kitchen Corral Wash, radiocarbon ages from similar deposits indicate six depositional phases separated by periods of incision or nondeposition beginning at 6320, 5650, 5390, 4330, 2145, and 340 years before present (Sable and Herford, 2004).

Qaf Alluvial-fan and eolian deposits (Holocene to upper Pleistocene) – Poorly to moderately sorted, non-stratified, subangular to subrounded, boulder- to clay-size sediment deposited at the mouths of washes in the southwest corner of the quadrangle; clasts are from the Shinarump Conglomerate Member of the Chinle Formation and the upper red member of the Moenkopi Formation; deposited principally as debris flows and debris floods on active depositional surfaces, but also has significant eolian component; 0 to 20 feet (0–6 m) thick.

Qape Alluvium and eolian pediment-mantle deposits (Holocene to upper Pleistocene) – Unconsolidated to weakly consolidated, clay- to small boulder-size debris that forms a pediment mantle, commonly with a thin cover of eolian sand and loess, principally on broad planar surfaces cut across the non-resistant Petrified Forest Member of the Chinle Formation, but also on the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation at the base of the Vermilion Cliffs, part next to cliffs still receives sediment and locally includes small, poorly sorted alluvial-fan, slope-wash, and minor talus deposits; lower end merges with mixed alluvial-colluvial (Qac) and mixed alluvial-eolian (Qae) deposits; some deposits are dissected and left as remnants as much as 60 feet (18 m) above modern drainages; important local source of sand and gravel; 0 to 20 feet (0–6 m) thick.

unconformity
Jks Springdale Sandstone Member of Kayenta Formation (Lower Jurassic) – Mostly pale-reddish-purple to pale-reddish-brown, moderately sorted, fine- to medium-grained, medium- to very thick bedded sandstone, and minor, thin, discontinuous lenses of intraformational conglomerate and thin interbeds of moderate-reddish-brown or greenish-gray mudstone and siltstone; has large lenticular and wedge-shaped, low-angle, medium-scale cross-bedding; secondary color banding that varies from concordant to discordant to cross-beds is common in the sandstone; weathers mostly to angular ledges that become more massive eastward along the Vermilion Cliffs, but locally forms more rounded cliffs that are typical of this member farther west (Hayden, 2011a); unconformable lower contact with the Whitmore Point Member of the Moenave Formation is placed at the base of the more massive, ledgy sandstone beds above the slope of interbedded mudstone and claystone; contains locally abundant petrified and carbonized fossil plant remains; deposited in braided-stream and minor floodplain environments (Clemmens and others, 1989; Blakey, 1994; Peterson, 1994; DeCourten, 1998); generally thickens eastward but locally thins and thins abruptly; 200 to 250 feet (60–75 m) thick.

unconformity, J-sub Kayenta of Blakey (1994) and Marzoff (1994), who proposed a major regional unconformity at the base of the Springdale Sandstone, thus restricting the Moenave Formation to the Dinosaur Canyon and Whitmore Point Members. Subsequent work by Lucas and Heckert (2001), Molina-Garza and others (2003), and Lucas and Tanner (2006) also suggested that the Springdale Sandstone is more closely related to, and should be made the basal member of, the Kayenta Formation.

JURASSIC/TRIASSIC
Moenave Formation
Jkm Moenave Formation, undivided – Shown on cross section only.

Jkm Whitmore Point Member (Lower Jurassic) – Interbedded, pale-reddish-brown, greenish-gray, and grayish-red mudstone and claystone, with thin-bedded, moderate-reddish-brown, very fine to fine-grained sandstone and siltstone; siltstone is commonly thin bedded to laminated in lenticular or wedge-shaped beds; claystone is generally flat bedded; locally contains 2- to 4-inch-thick (5–10 cm), bioturbated, cherty, very light gray to yellowish-gray, dolomitic limestone beds with algal structures, some altered to Jasper, and Semionovifossil fish scales; forms poorly exposed ledgy slope to the west near Kanab, the member consists of lower and upper lacustrine intervals separated by a red sandstone and siltstone ledge, but eastward, the lower lacustrine interval pinches out beneath the thickening red bed, resulting in a dramatic thinning of the unit (Hayden, 2011a, 2011b); in this quadrangle, the unit containing fish scales continues to thin to the center of the quad, where it then is traced eastward as a finer grained marker bed that forms a break in slope in the nearby Vermilion Cliffs; no fish scales were found in this bed along the east side of the quadrangle; lower, conformable contact is placed at a pronounced break in slope at the base of the lowest light gray, thin-bedded, dolomitic limestone (where present) and above the thicker bedded, reddish-brown sandstone and siltstone ledges of the Dinosaur Canyon Member; deposited in low-energy lacustrine and fluvial environments (Clemmens and others, 1989; Blakey, 1994; Peterson, 1994; DeCourten, 1998; Milner and Kirkland, 2006); thickness to the west from 20 to 50 feet (6–15 m).

Jkm Dinosaur Canyon Member (Lower Jurassic to Upper Triassic) – Uniformly colored, interbedded, generally thin bedded, moderate-reddish-brown to moderate-reddish-orange, very fine to fine-grained sandstone, very fine grained silt sandstone, and lesser siltstone and mudstone; ripple marks and mud cracks common; forms ledgy slope that steepens eastward; forms the base of Vermilion Cliffs step of the Grand Staircase (Gregory, 1950); to the west in the St. George area, a thin chert pebble conglomerate marks the base of the unit and the unconformity (Hayden, 2005, 2011c), but in this area, a 1.5- to 2-foot-thick (0.5–0.6 m) gypsum bed with local chert pebbles is more common; unconformable lower contact is placed at the base of the chert pebble conglomerate or gypsum bed where recognized, otherwise, it is placed at the prominent color and lithology change from reddish-brown siltstone above to pale-greenish-gray mudstone of the Chinle Formation below; deposited on broad, low floodplain that was locally shallowly flooded (fluvial mud flat) (Clemmens and others, 1989; Blakey, 1994; Peterson, 1994; DeCourten, 1998); thickness varies from 200 to 300 feet (60–90 m).

Jkm **T-5 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-5 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

TRIASIC
Chinle Formation
Jcu Upper members, undivided (Upper Triassic) – Highly variegated, light-brownish-gray, pale-greenish-gray, to grayish-purple bentonitic shale, mudstone, siltstone, and claystone, with lesser thick-bedded, resistant sandstone and pebble- to small-cobble conglomerate near base; clasts are primarily chert and quartzite; contains minor chert, nodular limestone, and very thin coal seams and lenses as much as 0.5 inch (1 cm) thick; mudstone weathers to a "popcorn" surface due to expansive clays and causes road and building foundation problems; contains locally abundant, brightly colored, fossilized wood; weathers to badland topography; prone to landsliding along steep hillsides, however, most outcrops within this quadrangle have fairly low relief; some of the best exposed outcrops are protected from erosion by a cap of mixed alluvial and eolian pediment-mantle deposits (Qape) at the base of the Vermilion Cliffs; mostly slope forming; consists mostly of the Petrified Forest and Owl Rock Members, but may include other upper Chinle units; lower contact with the Shinarump Conglomerate Member of the Chinle Formation is placed at the base of the purple-gray clay slope and above the prominent sandstone and conglomerate ledge; deposited in lacustrine, floodplain, and braided-stream environments (Stewart and others, 1972a; Dabiel, 1994); poorly exposed within the quadrangle due to cover by eolian sand (Qes), mixed alluvial and eolian pediment-mantle deposits (Qape), alluvial-eolian deposits (Qae), and alluvial-colluvial deposits (Qac); thickness is 450 to 600 feet (140–195 m).

Jcu **T-3 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-3 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-5 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-5 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-3 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-3 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-5 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-5 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-3 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-3 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-5 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-5 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-3 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-3 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-5 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-5 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-3 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-3 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-5 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-5 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-3 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-3 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-5 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-5 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-3 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-3 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-5 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-5 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-3 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-3 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-5 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-5 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-3 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-3 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-5 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-5 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-3 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-3 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-5 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-5 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-3 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-3 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-5 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-5 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-3 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-3 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-5 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-5 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-3 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-3 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-5 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-5 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-3 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-3 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-5 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-5 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-3 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-3 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-5 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-5 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-3 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-3 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-5 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-5 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-3 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-3 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-5 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-5 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-3 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-3 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-5 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-5 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-3 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-3 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-5 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-5 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-3 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-3 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-5 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-5 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-3 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-3 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-5 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-5 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-3 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-3 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-5 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-5 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).

Jcu **T-3 unconformity**, previously J-0 of Phipprigos and O'Sullivan (1978), who thought it was at the Jurassic-Triassic boundary; however, the Jurassic-Triassic boundary is now considered to be within the Dinosaur Canyon Member of the Moenave Formation and is not at an unconformity, thus the regional unconformity is in Upper Triassic strata and is probably the T-3 unconformity of Lucas and Tanner (2007) (see also Molina-Garza and others, 2003; Kirkland and Milner, 2006).