

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF MINES

WASHINGTON

October 5, 1934.

Mr. A. Donley Barnes,  
Grants Pass,  
Oregon.

Dear Mr. Donley:

Your letter dated September 12, to Mr. Paul M. Tyler with which you were good enough to send specimens including the polished gems, has been referred to me for reply.

So far as I can find, the name "oregonite" has not been used in mineralogy and therefore I can see no reason why you should not call your material by that name. I have not yet had microscopic sections to examine, but from an examination by a hand lens the material looks very much like the jasper occurring in the Franciscan rocks in California and would, therefore, tentatively be described as a spotted jasper. I hope to have sections within a few days and if on examination I find data of interest you will hear from me further.

I am turning the specimens, except the material for sections, over to the United States National Museum from which you may also hear.

I note that some of the material shows orbicules with as many as eight spheroidal layers. These, in the absence of a microscopic examination, suggest that the material may have been pisolitic. If you could send me a larger specimen showing these pisolitic sections I should appreciate it. The quality makes no difference as I want it only for the petrographic relationships. I inclose a tag under which the specimen may be sent.

Cordially,

Frank L. Hess,  
Principal Mineralogist.

Incl. 2475

State of Oregon  
DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY AND MINERAL INDUSTRIES  
1069 State Office Building  
Portland 1, Oregon

January 31, 1961

To: Len Ramp

From: Hollis Dole

The attached was called to my attention by Andy. Lloyd Staples is very much against giving names such as "oregonite," "medfordite," etc., to any old rock or mineral. You'd better be prepared to answer Lloyd on this in your speech before the Academy. The attached is sent so that you will be familiar with the true "oregonite."

*AWD*

HMD:lk  
Attach.