# Structural Evaluation of the Tom Deposit, Selwyn Basin, Yukon Quinton Willms<sup>[1]</sup>, Kenneth Hickey<sup>[1]</sup>, Jack Milton<sup>[2]</sup>

## FIREWEEDZINC

## Introduction

Stratiform Pb-Zn orebodies that make up shale-hosted nassive sulfide (SHMS) deposits account for 40% of Zn and 60% of Pb reserves globally (Tikkanen, 1986). SHMS deposits form at shallow depths and low temperatures in reduced sedimentary basins from upwelling

ydrothermal fluids that circulate through the sedimentary sequence scavenging metals during extension. The structural geology of basin genesis along

vnsedimentary fault conduits is crucial to understanding the formation of Pb-Zn-Ag shale-hosted stratiform sulfide deposits. Fluid circulation is dependent on faults to provide vertical permeability across otherwise impermeable



Yukon near the Northwest Territories border and the community of Ross River.

sedimentary layering. Defining the fault architecture of a basin is a critical step in reconstructin basin geometry and identifying prospective areas for SHMS mineralization.

The Selwyn Basin, Yukon, comprises a sequence of clastic sedimentary rocks that host several large SHMS deposits, including the Tom and Jason deposits of the Macmillan Pass area (Fig. 1 (Abbott and Turner, 1991). These deposits are hosted in Devonian strata that have been extensively folded by mid-Cretaceous crustal shortening.

This project intends to build on and improve upon previous local mapping if the Macmillan Pas nineralization in the Selwyn Basin.

Evaluating the structural controls of the Macmillan Pass area and identification of fault geomery and kinematic histories further defines the structural geometry, spatial variation in strain accommodation, overprinting relationships and current state of SHMS mineralization seen at th Fom Deposit (Fig 2).

## **Background**

The supercontinent Rodinia underwent protracted extension and rifting in the Late Neoproterozoic Early Cambrian resulting in the formation of a passive margin on the northwestern margin of the new Laurtentia continent (Nelson et al., 2013). During this time, the Neoproterozoic to Lower Devonian Paleozoic Selwyn basin formed as a large marine depocenter along the northern Laurentian passive margin in what is now central-eastern Yukon. The Selwyn basin was bound on its eastern margin by he similarly aged Mackenzie carbonate platform that developed on the Laurentian continental shelf

From the Late Devonian, the Laurentian passive margin transitioned into convergent margin with eastward directed subduction (Nelson et al., 2013). Subduction was accompanied by back-arc exten sion and the formation of back-arc basins into which Devonian to Carboniferous sediments were deposited over Selwyn Basin strata. The Macmillan Pass SHMS deposits are hosted in one such Mid-Devonian to Mississippian extensional basin. Back-arc related sedimentation in the Selwyn basin ended prior to final accretion of the peri-Laurentian and Insular terranes to ancestral North America in the Middle Jurassic (Nelson et al., 2013).

Continued subduction and plate convergence through the Jurassic and Cretaceous resulted in the Cordilleran orogeny. Within the Selwyn basin this orogeny is expressed as a foreland fold and thrus belt that is up to 130 km wide. The Macmillan Pass SHMS deposits occur at eastern edge of this be west of a transition into a temporally equivalent fold and thrust belt in Mackenzie platform strata.



Figure 2: Geological mapping of the Tom deposit. A number of faults are seen, with the most significant being the Eastern Fault, Panhandle Fault and the late Tom Fault.

<sup>[1]</sup> University of British Columbia, Department of Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences, Faculty of Science. 2020 – 2207 Main Mall, Vancouver, BC Canada, V6T 1Z4 [2] Fireweed Zinc Ltd. Suite 1020, 800 Pender Street, Vancouver, BC, Canada, V6C 2V6





ipright F2 folds and a weak F3 buckling before returning to monoclinal layering to the North.

The first major deformation event, D1, is defined by tight, upright folds but is also seen as

ately inclined plunge. The average F1 fold axis is 01 -> 281. Undulating buckle folds of the

The last deformation event, D3, is the final and weakest event. It is dominated by a planar,

fault, Panhandle fault, and the Tom fault. The Eastern and Panhandle faults are near-vertica truncate and displace the northernmost extent of Tom East. The Tom fault is an extensive, vertical, north-trending structure thought to be a post-Cordilleran folding with little local







the Eastern Fault and the Tom Fault may either displace Tom East into the sky or further to the North at depth. Antiform synform pair plunge South.

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Earth, Ocean and **Atmospheric Sciences** Faculty of Science



Government of Canada



### Discussion

East of the Macmillan River and local to the Tom deposit, an early stage of deformation is recognized. The timing of this deformation event (D1) is poorly constrained. Previous regional mapping west of the Macmillan river indicate that thrust faulting in the north block cut F2 folding prior to the emplacement of Cretaceous dykes, placing a minimum age for D2 deformation as Cretaceous (Willms, et al, 2020).

he relative timing of movement between the Eastern and Tom Faults is poorly constrained. If the Eastern Fault was first ctive, it is likely that northern most extent of Tom East has been truncated, uplifted and eroded. Conversely, if the Tom Fault was first active, the continuation of Tom East may be displaced down to the north, in the subsurface where similar tratigraphy and folding occur (Fig 8).

he Panhandle Fault has red pervasive hematite staining of fault gouge and nearby rock units resultant from groundwa er circulation. The fault is exposed at surface over several kilometres. The fault offsets the 1km thick package of the Fuller Lake member to a resultant 300m section to the southeast termed the 'panhandle.'

he Tom Fault is a near-vertical normal fault and trends almost due north for tens of kilometres. It offsets both the Tom East and Tom West to the south of their extents. Stratigraphic displacements across the fault indicate total displaceme less than a kilometre. Contrary to previous interpretations, we suggest the Tom Fault is a Cretacous structure unrelated to the mineralization at the Tom deposit.

he timing of the Eastern Fault and Panhandle Fault is poorly constrained. Further investigation is required as the orier ation of these faults is similar to regional Devonian structures, diamictite is proximal to the Eastern Fault, and fluid movement is spatially associated with the Panhandle Fault. Is it possible that these faults were feeder structures for mineralization?