

Newberry Showcase Presentation – May 11, 2011 Draft

- I. Introduction (Taylor)
- II. Geologic Setting
 - a. Physiographic Setting (Rick)
 - b. Tectonic Setting (Bill and Dan)
 - i. Meigs et al. Paper + Newberry Papers
 - c. Stratigraphy-Geologic History of Newberry (Jody and Kelsii)
 - i. Meigs et al. Paper + Newberry Papers
- III. Statement Of The “Cinder Cone Problem” (Taylor)
 - a. Newberry Cinder Cone Research – Previous Work
 - i. Cinder Cone Morphology / Age Implications
 - ii. Cinder Cone Alignment / Structural Control Implications
- IV. Methodology Papers / Review of Literature
 - a. Age-Erosion-Morphology Concept (Rick and Dan)
 - b. Structural Control Topic – Overview of Cinder Cone Emplacement Process (Jody)
 - c. Two-Point Alignment Method (Lutz, Cebrini) (Bill)
 - d. Lidar Methods / Oregon Consortium Effort (Kelsii)
- V. New Research / Project Results – Intro/Transition (Taylor)
 - a. Cinder Cone Drainage Density Calculations (Includes Implications / Conclusions) (Jody)
 - b. Cone Volume Comparison of Usgs 10-M Dem vs. Lidar methods (Includes Implications / Conclusions) (Dan)
 - c. 2-Point Analysis / Modified Methods (Includes Implications / Conclusions) (Bill)
 - d. Test Glacial Hypothesis with Qualitative Analysis of Landforms Using Lidar (Includes Implications / Conclusions) (Rick)
 - e. Digitize Lava Flow Margins and Flow Structure – Method Exploration (Includes Implications / Conclusions) (Kelsii)
- VI. Future Research Directions (Taylor)
 - a. Lidar – Methodology
 - b. Cinder Cone Geochemistry
 - c. Soils Chronology
- VII. Summary (Team – 1 Bullet per Person)
- VIII. Acknowledgments (Taylor)