

CORRECTION TO RECORDS - GGS 171 and GGS 172

On March 11, 1980, as I was logging GGS 172 in northern Emanuel county, I kept coming across samples which seemed spurious. Other loggers had noticed this fact also; several of the sample envelopes (with interval designations which overlapped or duplicated labelled intervals more correlative with this area) had pencilled comments on them saying "Hawthorne lithology with Ocala forams" or "Hawthorne lithology" usually followed by a question mark. I shared this concern, because detailed correlation work I was doing in the area indicated that this well, being in the Ogeechee river valley, was drilled where any updip Miocene sediments would be lacking in a position where Barnwell sediments would be in outcrop or subcrop (also as indicated by the samples which were correctly labelled). Sensing simple human error rather than foul play, I looked into the sequential GGS well book and found that the drillers, Beddingfield and Fallin, had also drilled another oil test hole, GGS 171, in Brantley county, where the expected sequence, going downward, is 600 plus feet of Hawthorne sediments, followed by a thin Suwannee limestone and a 300' Ocala limestone.

These downdip marine units in Brantley county, with the well-rounded non-feldspathic quartz sand and coarse black phosphate pellets of the Hawthorne, and the non-arenaceous bioclastic limestones of the Suwannee and Ocala formations, with their distinctive benthonics (Nummulites, Asterocyclina, Heterostegina, and Operculinoides), are easy to distinguish from the poorly sorted feldspathic sands, calcareous silts, and recrystallized macrofossiliferous arenaceous limestones of the updip Barnwell and Clairborne-age sediments, so a quick examination of each sample envelope was enough to place it in the proper box. I "x-ed" through the

mistakenly labelled envelopes and pencilled in the correct GGS number on each one. Now perhaps both wells will be more useful. There remains the problem of the Ocala foraminifera in two or three of the shallow (300 ft) Hawthorne samples, but I will let someone concerned with Brantlye county worry over this one. The interval from 65 to 140 feet is missing in GGS #172, and the interval from 0 to 240 feet, once considered missing, is now present in the Brantley county cuttings. I would conjecturize that the drillers sent both sets of cuttings, labelled as to interval but not as to well, to the State Survey, and this caused the problem. Only two of the envelopes originally in the Brantley county box were correctly labelled!

Julian E. Howell
3/14/80