Drainage reorganization and Laramide tectonics in north-central New Mexico and downstream effects in the Gulf of Mexico
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Abstract
The El Rito and Galisteo depocenters in north-central New Mexico archive tectonically-driven Paleogene drainage reorganization, the effects of which influenced sedimentation along the northwestern margin of the Gulf of Mexico. Although separated by ~100 km and lacking depositional chronology for the El Rito Formation, the two aforementioned New Mexican depocenters are commonly considered remnants of a single basin with coeval deposition and shared accommodation mechanism. Detrital zircon U-Pb maximum depositional ages indicate that the El Rito and Galisteo formations are not coeval. Moreover, stratigraphic thickness trends and mapping relationships indicate different accommodation mechanisms for the Galisteo and El Rito depocenters; tectonically-induced subsidence versus infilling of incised topography, respectively. The regional unconformity that bounds the base of both the El Rito and Galisteo formations is a correlative surface induced by local tectonic activity and associated drainage reorganization in the early Eocene, and was diachronously buried by northward onlap of fluvial sediments. Detrital zircon distributions in both depocenters indicate increased recycling of Mesozoic strata above the unconformity, but diverge upsection as topographic prominence of local basement-involved uplifts waned. Sediment capture in these depocenters is coeval with deposition in other externally-drained Laramide basins. Further, it corresponds to a period of low Laramide province-derived sediment input and replacement by Appalachian-sourced sediment along the northwestern margin of the Gulf of Mexico during a basin-wide transgression. This illustrates the potential effect that pockets of sediment storage within the catchment of a transcontinental drainage system can have over the sedimentary record in the receiving marine basin.
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1 | INTRODUCTION

Drainage reorganization and in-route sediment storage plays a fundamental role in the evolution of source-to-sink depositional systems, and the sedimentary record of those systems preserved in the receiving marine basin (i.e., the ultimate sink; Figure 1). Stream piracy, changes in climate, large-scale tectonic activity, or local changes at the headwaters of rivers can drive changes in sediment routing and storage. Interpretation of the geologic record often depends on accurate identification of drainage reorganization events because they can affect the sediment composition and flux, as well as the isotopic composition of transported sediment (Clift, Blusztajn, & Nguyen, 2006) and water (Davis, Wiegand, Carroll, & Chamberlain, 2008). However, in-route sediment storage may compromise the fidelity of marine records of hinterland activity by altering the sediment character and volume in the ultimate sink (Nie et al., 2015). Therefore, linking specific upstream reorganization events with downstream effects is complicated by large distances, non-unique changes in sediment character, temporary or permanent in-route sediment storage, and poorly understood fluvial pathways.

Intraplate deformation within the Laramide province (Figure 2a) drove local- and continental-scale drainage dynamics through a series of principally internally (i.e., ponded) and externally (i.e., axial and perimeter) drained basins (Dickinson et al., 1988; Lawton, 2008), and was the primary source of sediment in the Gulf of Mexico during the Paleogene (Galloway, Whiteaker, & Ganey-Curry, 2011). Externally draining basins acted as the upstream gatekeepers of clastic material in route to the Gulf of Mexico, sequestering more sediment during periods of increased accommodation and contributing more sediment during periods of bypass and erosion. Details of these upstream controls on downstream depositional processes and products in this continental-scale source-to-sink system remain preliminary, in part due to poor documentation of the evolution of upstream (source) regions.

We investigate the relationship between the Paleogene drainage reorganization in north-central New Mexico and local tectonic activity. We compare our findings to coeval sedimentation along the northwest margin of the Gulf of Mexico. We interpret early Eocene tectonic activity of the Nacimiento Gallina-Archuleta (NGA) Uplift to be the primary driver of drainage reorganization in our area of focus, the El Rito and Galisteo depocenters (Figures 2 and 3). Spatial variability in unconformity development, stratigraphic architecture, and sediment provenance within the depocenters record the basins’ response to this relatively rapid tectonic episode. Sediment provenance in both depocenters indicate an increased recycling of Mesozoic sedimentary strata across this unconformity. However, there is a difference in the duration

**FIGURE 1** Schematic (not to scale) sediment transport pathways (approximately parallel and perpendicular to the down-dip transect) illustrating sources and sinks potentially encountered by transcontinental river systems. In-route storage and secondary source contribution of sediment can affect sediment character and volume while downstream dilution obscures sediment source signals through fluvial integration in the receiving marine basin (i.e., ultimate sink)
of unconformity development and a divergent evolution of sediment provenance following the initial phase of increased recycled Mesozoic strata between the two depocenters. Periods of erosion within the Galisteo depocenter, as well as other externally draining basins (Dickinson et al., 1988) contained within the Colorado-Brazos River catchment (Blum et al., 2017), correspond to enhanced sedimentation rates in the Gulf of Mexico (Galloway et al., 2011). Conversely, during waning tectonic activity and sediment capture in the Galisteo depocenter areas as well as other Laramide basins, resulting sediment volumes greatly decreased along the Gulf of Mexico margin (Galloway et al., 2011), which enabled westward infiltration of Appalachian-derived sediment into the distal reaches of the Colorado-Brazos River system during the middle Eocene. Synthesis of previous work and new data presented herein record the tectonic activity and basin development driving hinterland drainage reorganization of primary and secondary rivers within a long-lived continental scale drainage system.

2 | GEOLOGIC BACKGROUND

2.1 | Geologic setting

The North American western interior experienced a fundamental shift in deformation style and sedimentation during the Late Cretaceous–Paleogene. Prior to this shift, a broad, retro-arc foreland basin stretched across western North America in response to flexural loading by the Sevier fold and thrust belt (DeCelles, 2004). Beginning in Late Cretaceous time, exhumation of basement-cored uplifts (i.e., the “Laramide Orogeny”) dissected this contiguous foreland basin (Cather, 2004; Coney & Reynolds, 1977; Dickinson & Snyder, 1978; Gries, 1983), which disrupted and rerouted pre-existing drainage networks, while recycling foreland basin sediments, and exhuming older sources (Dickinson et al., 1988; Lawton, 2008). Many researchers interpret shallow angled subduction of the Farallon slab and the conjugates of the Shatsky and Hess oceanic plateaus.
beneath western North America to have driven the transition from Sevier thin-skinned fold-and-thrust belt deformation to basement-involved, intra-foreland faulting (Coney & Reynolds, 1977; Copeland, Currie, Lawton, & Murphy, 2017; Dickinson & Snyder, 1978; Humphreys, 2009; Liu et al., 2010; Liu & Currie, 2016; Tarduno, McWilliams, Debiche, Sliter, & Blake, 1985). Basement-involved uplifts produced a series of broken foreland and intermontane basins (DeCelles, 2004), which serve as a patchwork record of Late Cretaceous-early Paleogene tectonic activity and drainage dynamics.

### 2.1.1 Laramide basin development & deformation in north-central New Mexico

The El Rito, Galisteo, and Diamond Tail formations are interpreted to be deposited within a single Laramide basin (Dickinson et al., 1988; Ingersoll, Cavazza, Baldridge, & Shafiqullah, 1990; Lucas, 1984; Yin & Ingersoll, 1997), one of several north-south trending “axial” basins developed between “perimeter” basins to the east and “ponded” basins to the west (Dickinson et al., 1988). Dickinson et al. (1988) defined axial basins as elongate depocenters with small areas, high-relief margins, and dominated by alluvial deposition. Several accommodation mechanisms have been proposed to explain subsidence of the Galisteo and El Rito depocenters. These include deposition within a synclinal sag in the shared hanging wall between two bivergent thrust systems (Yin & Ingersoll, 1997) and deposition in a pull-apart basin formed by dextral transtension (Cather, 1992).

Uplift and exhumation of bounding basement blocks to the El Rito and Galisteo depocenters commenced in the Late Cretaceous. The uplift to the east (i.e., Brazos-Sangre de Cristo (BSC) Uplift) was a dominant sediment source and Galisteo Basin-bounding feature throughout most of the depocenter’s existence while the western uplift (i.e., NGA Uplift) remained comparatively insignificant until the Eocene. East and northeast of the El Rito and Galisteo depocenters, east-vergent thrust faults exhumation of the BSC Uplift (Figure 2c; Baltz, 1965; Lindsey, 1998; Lisenbee, 2013). The Sangre de Cristo portion of the uplift provided sediment to the Raton Basin (Figure 2b) (Baltz, 1965; Pillmore & Flores, 1990). West of the El Rito and Galisteo depocenters, east-vergent thrust faults exhumation of the BSC Uplift (Cather, 1992). Apatite fission-track (AFT) ages along the Nacimiento Uplift increase northward, from middle Eocene–earliest Oligocene ages (46 ± 5 to 33 ± 4 Ma) in the south, to Late Cretaceous–middle Eocene ages (81 ± 8 to 46 ± 7 Ma) in the north (Kelley, Chapin, & Corrigan, 1992). Kelley et al. (1992) favor a middle Eocene onset of exhumation and cooling; they attribute the wide range of ages in the north to
2.1.2 | New Mexico volcanism

The Cretaceous–middle Eocene was marked by brief pulses of volcanism that were most dominant in southern New Mexico and southern Colorado (i.e., the Colorado Mineral Belt) (Chapin, Wilks, & McIntosh, 2004). Cretaceous and Paleocene volcanism was restricted to the southernmost part of New Mexico where magmatic conduits exploited Proterozoic sutures (Chapin et al., 2004; Karlstrom & Bowring, 1988; Karlstrom & Humphreys, 1998). Activity increased and swept northward from early to late Eocene, and has continued to present, with a brief lull during the middle Miocene (Chapin et al., 2004). Prior to the middle Miocene, intermediate and felsic volcanism was dominant, whereas subsequent volcanic activity was predominantly basaltic (Chapin et al., 2004). From late Eocene through Oligocene time (37–23 Ma), New Mexico experienced three periods of explosive ignimbrite volcanism (Chapin et al., 2004). The first of these three eruptive episodes occurred between 37.5 and 31.4 Ma, and therefore overlaps with late-stage, basement-involved shortening. This initial pulse primarily affected the Trans-Pecos and Mogollon-Datil regions in west Texas and southwest New Mexico, respectively (Figure 2), but some volcanic activity stretched into north-central New Mexico (Cather, 1990; Chapin et al., 2004). The role of explosive volcanism is particularly important to sediment character, as distribution of volcanic material over a broad area may have affected drainage networks that would not otherwise contain any upstream volcanic source. Increased volcanic activity resulted in a transition from quartz-rich to volcanioclastic sedimentation between the Galisteo and Espinaso formations (Lisenbee, 2013; Smith et al., 1991; Stearns, 1953), which occurred at ~38 Ma (Prothero & Lucas, 1996).

2.1.3 | Stratigraphy of the El Rito and Diamond Tail-Galisteo depocenters

The El Rito Formation is exposed north of Jemez Caldera (Figures 2 and 3) and is identified by its brick-red color, coarse-grained sandstones, and quartzite clast-dominant, cobble–boulder conglomerate lithology (Bingler, 1968). Heretofore, the thickest documented section of El Rito Formation was ~60 m in the Ortega Mountains (Bingler, 1968), which is part of the Tusas Mountains (Figure 3). The absence of absolute depositional chronology has rendered age assignment for the El Rito Formation difficult, and the unit was assumed to be roughly correlative with the Eocene Galisteo Formation (Baltz, 1978; Cather, 2004; Logsdon, 1981; Lucas & Ingersoll, 1981). However, recently Donahue (2016) assigned a 32.3 ± 3.2 (1σ) Ma depositional age based on detrital zircon U-Pb maximum depositional ages. A high-relief angular unconformity separates the basal conglomerates of the El Rito Formation from the underlying rocks that range from Precambrian to Cretaceous age (Cather, 2004). Exposure of the El Rito Formation is limited, but a fining trend from northeast to southwest is discernable (Logsdon, 1981). Paleocurrent data generally indicate a southerly sediment transport direction (Logsdon, 1981). The El Rito Formation is unconformably overlain by the Oligocene Ritito Formation, but this contact is reported as locally conformable in a few locations (Bingler, 1968).

The Diamond Tail and Galisteo formations are exposed in the Galisteo depocenter (Figure 3, Lucas et al., 1997), which is located ~100 km south of the El Rito depocenter. The Diamond Tail Formation was not recognized as a stratigraphic unit separate from the Galisteo Formation before Lucas et al. (1997), but this stratigraphic interval was noted to thin north-northwestward by >700 m over approximately 15 km (Gorham & Ingersoll, 1979). The Diamond Tail Formation is thickest in the Hagan area (442 m, Figure 3), sits unconformably above the Cretaceous Menefee Formation, and is informally divided into lower, middle, and upper members (Lucas et al., 1997). The lower and upper members of the Diamond Tail Formation comprise predominantly amalgamated, sharp-based sandstones containing rip-up clasts, and fossil logs, whereas the middle member is primarily variegated mudstone (Lucas et al., 1997). The Diamond Tail Formation is assigned to the late Paleocene–early Eocene based on the lowermost Eocene index fossil (Hyracotherium sp.) identified in the upper portion of the middle member (Cather, Connell, Lucas, Picha, & Black, 2002; Lucas et al., 1997).

The Diamond Tail Formation is unconformably overlain by the Galisteo Formation, which is 979 m thick in the Hagan area (Lucas et al., 1997). Biostratigraphic data indicates that
the Galisteo Formation spans most of the Eocene (Lucas, 1982; Lucas & Williamson, 1993). However, the same index fossil (*Hyracotherium* sp.) is found in the middle Diamond Tail Formation and also in the lower Galisteo Formation, indicating that the intra-formational unconformity represents ≤6 M.y. (Cather, 2004; Woodburne & Swisher, 1995). The El Rito and Galisteo formations have been interpreted as coeval deposits that share a proximal to distal relationship, respectively (Baltz, 1978; Cather, 2004; Gorham, 1979; Gorham & Ingersoll, 1979; Logsdon, 1981; Lucas, 1984; Yin & Ingersoll, 1997). The Galisteo Formation records fluvi-vaic system resided on top of the older paleo-Rio Grande and Houston-Brazos fluvio-deltaic system (Galloway et al., 2011) throughout Paleocene–Eocene time. Although previously discriminated as two separate systems, recent paleogeographic reconstructions suggest that the paleo-Colorado and Houston-Brazos fluvial-deltaic systems were, if not identical, at least geographically and temporally overlapping. These two fluvio-deltaic systems were distinguished as two separate sediment sources to the Gulf of Mexico based on sandstone petrography (Galloway et al., 2011; Loucks, Dodge, & Galloway, 1986). However, Blum et al. (2017) combined the Colorado and Houston-Brazos systems into the paleo-Colorado-Brazos fluvial network based on detrital zircon U-Pb data. In the fluvial model of Galloway et al. (2011) portions of the Colorado and Houston-Brazos rivers’ inputs occupy similar geographic areas in interleaved stratigraphic intervals throughout the Paleocene–Eocene. Their model also proposes that the Colorado River disappeared as a major fluvial input during the mid-Eocene because its catchment was captured and divided between the paleo Rio Grande and Houston-Brazos River (Galloway et al., 2011). During that time, the Houston-Brazos fluvio-deltaic system resided on top of the older paleo-Colorado River delta (Galloway et al., 2011). In light of these numerous overlaps, we consider the paleo Colorado and Houston-Brazos fluvial systems to be a dynamic continuum of drainage primarily sourced by the expanding and contracting central and southern Laramide province catchment sensu Blum et al. (2017) and use the Colorado-Brazos terminology.

### 2.2 Potential Paleogene sediment sources

We define twelve sediment sources that were potential contributors of detritus to the El Rito and Galisteo depocenters (Table 1). We also describe two conditional sources that are applied sparingly in mixture modeling of basin samples (see *DZmix* description below), but provide important insight where applicable. Below we describe potential sources from oldest to youngest, and include location, lithology, and detrital zircon U-Pb age distributions (see Table 1 for references).

The oldest sources include metamorphic and igneous basement: the ~1.7 Ga Ortega Quartzite (similar depositional age and detrital zircon unimodal age distribution; Jones,

### 2.1.4 The Laramide province & the Gulf of Mexico

Withdrawal of the Western Interior Seaway in the late Cretaceous opened a fluvial corridor that connected North America’s western interior to the western margin of the Gulf of Mexico (Blum et al., 2017). Fluvial pathways and discharge into the gulf were controlled by several long-lived structural embayments whose up-dip catchments expanded and contracted in response to tectonic forcing (Blum et al., 2017; Galloway et al., 2011). During the Paleogene, sediment supply was predominantly controlled by tectonic activity and inactivity within the Laramide province (Galloway, 2002). Western interior-derived sediment was delivered to the Gulf of Mexico by a few transcontinental river systems (Galloway et al., 2011). Different interpretations propose that the El Rito and Galisteo depocenters drained into either the paleo-Colorado-Brazos River (Blum et al., 2017), or into paleo-Colorado and Rio Grande rivers (Galloway et al., 2011) throughout Paleocene–Eocene time.
TABLE 1  Summary of source group zircon geochronologic data used in this paper, both generated in this study and collected from previous publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source profile</th>
<th>Source group</th>
<th>Rock type</th>
<th>Unit(s)</th>
<th>PDP figure</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magmatic arc</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>Kaiparowits and Unita fms.</td>
<td>Figure 4a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>Lawton and Bradford (2011), Dyman et al. (2008), Laskowski et al. (2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Cretaceous</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>Mancos Shale and Mesa Verde Gp.</td>
<td>Figure 4b</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>Dickinson and Gehrels (2008b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Cretaceous</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>Dakota Fm.</td>
<td>Figure 4c</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>Bush et al. (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurassic</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>Morrison Fm.</td>
<td>Figure 4d</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>Dickinson and Gehrels (2008b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triassic</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>Chinle Fm.</td>
<td>Figure 4e</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Dickinson and Gehrels (2008a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eolianites</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>Entrada, Navajo, and Wingate fms.</td>
<td>Figure 4f</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>Dickinson and Gehrels, (2003)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Paleozoic</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>Sangre de Cristo Fm.</td>
<td>Figure 4g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>this study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Paleozoic</td>
<td>Sandstone</td>
<td>Madera Formation and Cutler Gp.</td>
<td>Figure 4h</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>this study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambrian gr.</td>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>Florida Mountain Gp.</td>
<td>Figure 4i</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Amato and Mack (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picuris Orogenic gr.</td>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>Caballo Mountain Gp.</td>
<td>Figure 4j</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Amato and Becker (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ortega Quartzite</td>
<td>Quartzite</td>
<td>Ortega Quartzite (undivided)</td>
<td>Figure 4k</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>Jones et al. (2009, 2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nacimiento gr.</td>
<td>Metagranite</td>
<td>Precambrian (undivided)</td>
<td>Figure 4l</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>this study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>San Jose Fm.</td>
<td>San Jose Formation</td>
<td>Figure 4m</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Donahue (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: Fm., formation; fms., formations; Gp., Group; gr., granite/granitoid; NE, northeast, NW, northwest. Further detail is provided in Appendix 4.

Connelly, Karlstrom, Williams, & Doe, 2009) (Figure 4k), the ~1.7 Ga Nacimiento granitoid (Figure 4i), the ~1.4 Ga Picuris Orogeny granitoid (Daniel et al., 2013) (Figure 4j), and ~500 Ma Cambrian igneous rocks (Figure 4i), each of which have roughly unimodal zircon age distributions of their respective ages. The Ortega Quartzite outcrops in the Tusas Mountains, which border the northeast edge of the study area (Figure 3). Its absence in the NGA Uplift makes the Ortega Quartzite an important source indicator of the BSC Uplift in local north-central New Mexico basins. Igneous and metaigneous rocks of the Yavapai-Mazatzal terrane including the Nacimiento granitoid outcrop are exposed in the NGA and northern Montosa uplifts. Cambrian igneous rocks have limited surface exposure, but are found in the Lobo and Pedernal Hills and Florida Mountains in New Mexico (Figure 2c), and in the Wet Mountains of central Colorado (Loring & Armstrong, 1980; McMillan & McLemore, 2001; Schoene & Bowring, 2006).

Paleozoic sedimentary sources include Pennsylvanian-Permian rocks to the east and west of the El Rito and Galisteo depocenters (Figure 4g and H, respectively). The presence of these sources indicates recycling of sedimentary rocks from the Paradox and Taos basins, and may suggest broader source areas than just the NGA and BSC uplifts. Northwestern Pennsylvanian-Permian rocks exhibit a predominantly unimodal detrital age distribution of ~1.7 Ga (Figure 4h), whereas coeval rocks to the northeast exhibit a bimodal detrital age distribution with populations centered around ~1.4 and ~1.7 Ga (Figure 4g).

The recycled Appalachian foreland basin source (Figure 4n) is one of two conditional source groups and is comprised of detrital zircon spectra from late Mississippian to Permian sedimentary rocks in the Appalachian Basin (Figure 4n, Table 1). This is considered a conditional source group because sediment directly sourced from Appalachian Basin rocks could only be recycled to the Gulf of Mexico and could not be a source for Laramide basins during the Paleogene (Galloway et al., 2011). Appalachian Basin deposits exhibit
a multimodal distribution containing significant populations at 1.3–1.0 Ga, and ~450 Ma, and subordinate populations at 3.0–2.5 Ga and 2.0–1.6 Ga.

Lower Mesozoic sedimentary sources include Jurassic eolianites (Navajo, Wingate, and Entrada formations) (Figure 4f), which are widely distributed across the four corners area (Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona) of western North America (Dickinson & Gehrels, 2003). Abundant basement-derived detritus was shed from the northern and western flanks of the BSC Uplift since the Late Cretaceous (Bush et al., 2016) and latest Paleocene-earliest Eocene (Cather, 2004; Smith, 1992), respectively, indicating that the BSC had been largely stripped of Mesozoic sedimentary cover. Therefore, within north-central New Mexico, the presence of recycled Mesozoic sedimentary strata in middle Eocene and younger basin fill is consistent with derivation from NGA Uplift. Eolian deposits exhibit a complex, multimodal distribution with significant populations at 3.0–2.5, 2.0–1.6, 1.3–1.0 Ga, and ~500 Ma (Figure 4f). Jurassic eolianites also exhibit multiple age modes spanning from 330 to 800 Ma with minor contributions between 300 and 180 Ma. The next two potential sources are the Triassic Chinle Formation (Figure 4e) and the Jurassic Morrison Formation (Figure 4d). Both formations outcrop across northern New Mexico and exhibit similar multimodal detrital zircon age distributions with notable age peaks of similar proportion at ~1.7 and ~1.4 Ga, a 1.3–1.0 Ga (Grenville) population, and an irregular distribution of Paleozoic and younger ages with dominant subpopulations in the Mesozoic.

Cretaceous rocks compose the next two potential sediment sources, and include the Lower Cretaceous fluvial sandstones of the Dakota Formation (Figure 4c), and Upper Cretaceous siliciclastic rocks (i.e., Mesa Verde Group and Mancos Shale) (Figure 4b), which are exposed across northern New Mexico. Cretaceous formations show similar
detrital zircon age distributions with populations of ~1.5 Ga, 1.3–1.0 Ga, 700 Ma, 400 Ma, and increasing abundances of 250–100 Ma ages skewed toward younger ages. The notable exception is the presence of a dominant ~1.8 age mode in Upper Cretaceous strata that is nearly absent in the early Cretaceous (Figure 3b–c).

The source containing the youngest zircons is the magmatic arc group (Figure 4a), comprised of samples of Upper Cretaceous and Paleogene strata from southern Utah (Laskowski, Decelles, & Gehrels, 2013). The magmatic arc source contains a notable peak at ~48 Ma, and populations at 70–110 and 140–180 Ma.

The Paleocene San Jose Formation is the second conditional source group (Figure 4m) and is comprised of two detrital zircon samples from the San Jose Formation of the San Juan Basin (Donahue, 2016). We characterize it as a conditional source group because it is interpreted to be deposited by earliest Eocene fluvial system that flowed through the Galisteo depocenter area on its way to the Gulf of Mexico (Galloway et al., 2011), and is therefore temporally and spatially limited in its application.

3 | METHODS

We employ a suite of tectono-stratigraphic tools and previously published data including geologic maps, stratigraphic sections, lithofacies and paleocurrent analyses, conglomerate clast-counts, and detrital zircon U-Pb geochronology to investigate deformation, basin development, and drainage reorganization recorded in the El Rito and Galisteo depocenters.

3.1 | Stratigraphic Analysis

Sections were measured using a standard 1.5 m Jacob's staff, and logged using lithofacies codes adapted from Miall (1978) (Table 2). Bedding geometry, lithofacies associations (Table 3), and auxiliary sedimentary features are also included in stratigraphic descriptions. In Red Wash Canyon and Arroyo del Cobre (Figure 5) the El Rito Formation was measured at decimeter resolution. The surrounding area was mapped to determine facies distributions and stratigraphic relationships (Figures 5 and 6). In the Galisteo depocenter samples were collected in the context of existing stratigraphic sections that cover the Diamond Tail and Galisteo formations (Gorham & Ingersoll, 1979; Lucas et al., 1997), which we augmented with our field observations (Figure 7).

3.2 | Paleocurrent analysis and clast counts

Paleocurrent measurements were taken from trough cross-stratified sandstones, clast-supported, imbricated conglomerates, and (rare) primary current lineations. Trough cross-stratification measurements follow methods outlined by DeCelles, Langford, and Schwartz (1983). All measurements were tilt corrected using Stereonet 9 (Cardozo & Allmendinger, 2013).

Clast counts were collected \( n \geq 100 \) in conglomeratic units and were counted on an approximately 100 x 100 cm grid. Clasts were divided into seven different categories based on lithology: quartzite, vein quartz, chert, conglomerate, sand/mudstone, meta-rhyolite, and granite.

3.3 | Detrital Zircon U-Pb geochronology

Approximately 2 kg of each detrital zircon sample were crushed, and disc milled to ≤400 µm disc spacing. Zircons from each sample were separated using standard separation techniques: hydraulic separation through a water table, density separation using methylene iodide (3.28 g/cm³), and magnetic separation on a Frantz Isodynamic Magnetic Separator. Grains were washed in nitric acid before being non-discriminately hand-picked under an Olympus SZX12 microscope and mounted on double-sided tape.

Zircon U-Pb age dates were determined at the University of Houston via laser-ablation inductively-coupled-plasma mass-spectrometry using a Photon Machines Analyte 193 ArF excimer laser attached to a pulse counting detector fitted to a Varian 810 quadrupole mass spectrometer (Shaulis, Lapen, & Toms, 2010). Analyses were

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Description of lithofacies used to describe measured sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lithofacies</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mm</td>
<td>Mudstone, massive/structureless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ml</td>
<td>Mudstone, laminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Mudstone, rippled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mh</td>
<td>Mudstone, horizontal bedded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sll</td>
<td>Sand, laminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Sand, rippled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>Sand, horizontal bedded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>Sand, planar cross-bedded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St</td>
<td>Sand, trough cross-bedded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sf</td>
<td>Sand, foresets (unable to distinguish type)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sx</td>
<td>Sand, soft-sedimentary deformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sm</td>
<td>Sand, massive/structureless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gci</td>
<td>Gravel, clast-supported, imbricated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gct</td>
<td>Gravel, clast-supported, trough cross bedded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gch</td>
<td>Gravel, clast-supported, horizontal bedded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gcm</td>
<td>Gravel, clast-supported, massive/structureless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gmm</td>
<td>Gravel, matrix-supported, massive/structureless</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Miall (1978).
performed using a 25–30 µm spot size and 240 shots at 10 Hz repetition rate, resulting in approximately 24 s of ablation with 7 s of background measurement followed by 13 s of washout.

Analysis involved repeat measurements of a primary standard after every 10 unknowns. The primary standard used to correct for inter- and intra-element fractionation (Gehrels, Valencia, & Ruiz, 2008) was zircon from a Bohemian Massif potassic granulite Plešovice with an ID-TIMS age of 337.13 ± 0.37 (2σ) Ma (Sláma et al., 2008). The uncertainty resulting from this correction is typically 1%–2% (2σ) for both 206Pb/238U and 207Pb/235U, and uncertainties of <15% for ages >600 Ma. In lieu of a common Pb correction (Stacey & Kramers, 1975) for ages <600 Ma, we accept grains whose 2σ uncertainty envelope is <15% discordant by comparison of the 206Pb/238U and 207Pb/235U ages. UPbToolbox was also used to produce all probability density plots (PDPs) of detrital zircon U-Pb data for detrital source groups and Paleogene sedimentary rocks (see Appendix 3 for raw and reduced data tables). Metadata for Laramide sink samples are presented in Table 4.

### Table 3

**Description of characteristics used to define facies associations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Facies association</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDB</td>
<td>Gravel-dominated braided stream</td>
<td>Identified by the dominant presence of clast-supported conglomerates (Gci, Gct, Gch and Gcm). Erosive basal surfaces. Commonly associated with channel-shaped lenses of medium to very coarse St and Sm containing gravel floaters and lenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDB</td>
<td>Sand-dominated braided stream</td>
<td>Identified by the dominant presence of amalgamated medium to very coarse-grained sandstone bodies. St is the most common lithofacies and sandstones often contain gravel floaters and lenses. Fining upward profiles are abundant. Two characteristics are used to distinguish SDB from MB: (a) lack of laterally accreting surfaces, and (b) infrequent association with FP lithofacies association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>Sand-dominated meandering stream</td>
<td>Identified by the dominant presence of amalgamated medium to very coarse-grained sandstone bodies that commonly fine upwards. FP elements are commonly interbedded with multi-story sandstone bodies. St and Sr are the most common lithofacies and sandstones often contain floating gravel clasts, but more frequently contain intrabasinal clasts (i.e., rip-ups). Two characteristics are used to distinguish MB from SDB: (a) notable presence of laterally accreting surfaces, and (b) ubiquitous association with FP lithofacies association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Flood plain</td>
<td>Identified by the heterogeneous assemblage of flood plain elements: flood plain, crevasse splays, and levee complexes. Flood plain deposited sediments are commonly structureless (Sm or Mm) due to pedogenic processes. Pedogenic fabrics such as caliche, rhizoliths, reduced root haloes, blocky ped fracture, and pedogenic slickensides are abundant. Terrestrial burrows are also common. Crevasse splays are identified by tabular sandstones interbedded with mudstones. Internally they are commonly structureless, but also may exhibit normal grading and Sr (sometimes climbing ripples). Levee complexes are identified as coarsening upward successions of sandstone beds (lenticular and tabular [at outcrop scale]) Commonly Sm and Sr, and are often associated with flood plain mudstones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGF</td>
<td>Unconfined sed. gravity flow</td>
<td>This uncommon lithofacies association is identified by its medium to very coarse massive/structureless sandstone. Abundant floating gravel clasts. Occasional gravel stringers suggest minor episodes of stream activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>This rare lithofacies association is identified by the presence of marine fossils and glauconite within siliciclastic mudstone to sandstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Volcanic</td>
<td>This rare lithofacies association is identified by the presence of volcanic tuff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diatrual zircon geochronology can be used to establish the maximum depositional age (MDA) of sedimentary rocks (Dickinson & Gehrels, 2009). This method produces MDAs closest to the depositional age of the rocks when there is proximal and contemporaneous volcanism within the catchment (Coutts, Matthew, & Hubbard, 2019; Hilbert-Wolf et al., 2017).
We used four methods to determine MDA for the three samples containing ample groups of Cenozoic–age zircons (Figure 8, Table 5). (a) The absolute youngest age possible is the youngest single grain (YSG, Dickinson & Gehrels, 2009). (b) The weighted mean of the three youngest grains (WM), can provide a more statistically robust approach but lacks a robust cut-off criterion for older ages (Dickinson & Gehrels, 2009; Hilbert-Wolf et al., 2017). (c) Youngest 1σ grain cluster (YC1σ) calculates MDA by identifying the youngest cluster of grains with overlapping 1σ uncertainty (n ≥ 2) and determining their weighted mean (Dickinson & Gehrels, 2009). (d) Youngest 2σ grain cluster (YC2σ) is similar to YC1σ, but uses the youngest cluster of grains overlapping at 2σ uncertainty (n ≥ 3) to calculate the weighted mean (Dickinson & Gehrels, 2009).

3.3.2 | Detrital zircon mixing model

We use the detrital zircon mixing model, DZmix (Sundell & Saylor, 2017), to aid in provenance interpretation of U-Pb geochronologic data. This MATLAB-based detrital zircon mixing model uses an inverse Monte Carlo approach to determine the proportions of various sources that can account for the age distribution in a derivative, mixed sample. Specifically, the model determines a range of source contributions by scaling each source age distribution by a random set of percent contributions that sum to 100%. This produces a single model age distribution that is quantitatively compared (see below) to a single basin sample. This process is repeated 100,000 times, comparing each randomly generated source mixture model to the same basin sample. The top 100 (0.1%) of all models ranked by Kuiper V (Kuiper, 1960) value are retained to calculate the mean and standard deviation of modeled source contributions. In this model, all potential sediment sources are considered equally likely because it is impossible to know a priori what sediment sources were contributing to the basin at the time of deposition. Setting such priors would effectively make the mixture modeling circular.

We use Kuiper V statistic provided by DZmix as the basis for sample-model comparison for the following reasons: (a) it is a well-established statistical method (Kuiper, 1960; Stephens, 1970; Press, 2007), (b) it is equally sensitive across all age ranges (Kuiper, 1960; Press, 2007; Wissink et al., 2018), and (c) our source group data is collected from multiple sources with varying methods of reporting uncertainty, and use of the Kuiper V value does not incorporate uncertainty into the comparisons.

FIGURE 5 Geologic map of Red Wash Canyon and Arroyo del Cobre region, New Mexico highlights the high-relief basal unconformity and the westward thinning of the El Rito Formation. The map combines mapping observations made in this study and modifications of geologic maps from Kelley et al. (2005) and Maldonado (2008)
4 | RESULTS

4.1 | Stratigraphy
The El Rito Formation in the Red Wash Canyon (i.e., western) and Arroyo del Cobre (i.e., eastern) areas sits in an angular unconformity above Mesozoic stratigraphy and is truncated by a disconformity below the Ritito Formation. The thickest section of the El Rito Formation (1ACRT and 2ACRT, total 92 m) to the east thins westward (RWRT, 41m) inside the erosional relief of the basal unconformity.
Farther west, thinner deposits of the El Rito Formation only preserve basal conglomerates inside of local erosional lows (channels) while in many other locations the formation is completely removed by the Ritito basal unconformity (Figure 5).

Lithofacies in the bottom half of the eastern section (Arroyo del Cobre) exhibit predominately imbricated, trough cross-stratified or massive cobble–boulder clast-supported conglomerates, which are interbedded with up to meter-thick trough cross-stratified sandstones and pedogenically-altered mudstones. The upper ~40 m preserves finer-grained lithofacies interspersed with erosive, channel-shaped sandstone bodies (commonly ≥1 m thick) featuring occasional epsilon cross-stratification. Fine–very fine grain sandstones in the upper ~10 m of the El Rito Formation were deposited in tabular (<0.5 m thick), sharp-based, internally structureless beds, and are interbedded with pedogenically-altered mudstones.

The western area (Red Wash Canyon) clearly exposes the onlapping relationship of the El Rito Formation with its high-relief basal unconformity (Figure 9c). The basal 8 meters of El Rito Formation in the western area exhibits similar gravel-dominated lithofacies as the lower ~45 m of the eastern section. An upsection increase in moderate- to well-developed paleosols, bioturbation (Figure 9b), and tabular sandstones indicate a transition to lower energy deposition. At the top of the section (Figure 6) a multi-story, erosive-based sandstone unit exhibits epsilon cross-strata and contains basal conglomeratic lags comprised of caliche clasts. The poorly exposed El Rito Formation–Ritito Formation unconformity marks the top of the western measured section.

The Diamond Tail Formation comprises upper and lower members that exhibit sandstone-dominant lithofacies and a middle member that is dominated by muddy, varicolored paleosols (Figure 7) (Lucas et al., 1997). The erosional contact between the Menefee Formation of the Mesaverde Group and the lower member of the Diamond Tail Formation marks the base of the Cenozoic section. The lower member contains thick (5–8 m), multi-story, gravel-based, erosive sandstone units that fine upward and commonly feature trough cross-strata, occasionally nested within meter-scale epsilon cross-strata. Soft sediment deformation is common. Sandstones contain coaly plant fragments and abundant rip-up clasts.
The middle member of the Diamond Tail Formation is lithostratigraphically identified as a ~150 m variegated mudstone interval (Lucas et al., 1997) and is poorly exposed in the study area. Outcrops are composed of highly weathered badlands featuring bedding-parallel bands of maroon-brown and light grey mudstones (Figure 9d).

The upper member of the Diamond Tail Formation exhibits similar, though slightly coarser facies than the lower member. The top of the upper member is marked by an unconformable contact with the Galisteo Formation. This contact exhibits a regional, but subtle angular unconformity (Cather, 2004). However, the contact also features high-angle (>10° dip) discordance between local rotated blocks of sandstone in the Diamond Tail Formation and the low angle dip of the overlying Galisteo Formation (Figure 9e).

The unconformity at the base of the first sandstone unit of the Galisteo Formation is a mappable feature (Figure 9d). The lower portion of the Galisteo Formation is dominantly mudstone (Gorham & Ingersoll, 1979) and is poorly exposed in the southern Galisteo depocenter. Sandstones of the lower Galisteo Formation are generally finer grained than sandstones found in the Diamond Tail Formation.

The uppermost exposure of the Galisteo Formation is comprised of poorly exposed tuff and intercalated massive volcaniclastic sandstone and mudstone beds. The top of the 3HBPS section is in the upper Galisteo Formation and is characterized by coarse-medium grained trough cross-beded sandstone bodies (Figure 7) containing abundant volcanic lithic grains. The higher proportion of volcanic lithic grains and the presence of a minor tuff bed indicate proximity to the top of the Galisteo Formation (Lisenbee, 2013; Stearns, 1953), and is the location of detrital zircon sample 3HBPS71.

4.2 | Paleocurrent data

Paleocurrent measurements from the El Rito Formation indicate an upsection rotation from eastward to south and even westward paleoflow in the western (Red Wash Canyon)
location, but are more consistently southward in the Arroyo del Cobre area, which is 2 km to the east (Figure 10b).

Paleocurrent indicators from clast-supported conglomerates in the basal El Rito Formation along the western portion of our study area \( (N = 8, n = 139, \text{where } N \text{ is the number of paleocurrent stations and } n \text{ is the number of measurements}), \) suggest a consistent east-directed paleoflow (Figure 10b). However, paleocurrent measurements from trough cross beds upslope \( (N = 6, n = 86) \) change and indicate variable south- and west-directed paleoflow. In contrast, in paleocurrent measurements in the eastern area yield consistently southwest and southeast paleoflow direction \( (N = 3, n = 49). \)

Although the El Rito Formation paleocurrent measurements presented herein are in general agreement with an overall southwest paleoflow direction, these data provide higher temporal and spatial resolution than previously reported (Logsdon, 1981).

Imbricated conglomerate clast orientations indicate a southwest paleoflow direction \( (N = 1, n = 17) \) in the aluvial fan facies of the El Rito Formation in the Tusas Mountains (Figure 3 and Appendix 1). At this location, there is an upslope decrease in clast size, and an increase in bed organization. Lithofacies transition from matrix- (predominately medium-coarse sand) and clast-supported disorganized conglomerate with boulders up to 2 m diameter at the base of the El Rito Formation to clast-supported, crudely horizontally bedded, imbricated cobble conglomerate at the top.

Galisteo depocenter trough cross-bedding \( (N = 4, n = 74) \) and primary current lineations \( (N = 1, n = 13) \) from this study generally show southwest-directed paleoflow (Figure 10a). However, when added to the more comprehensive dataset from Cather et al. (2002) there is a dominant southeast paleoflow direction for both the Diamond Tail and Galisteo formations (Figure 10a). These data indicate higher variability in the Galisteo Formation paleocurrent measurements compared to those of the Diamond Tail Formation. Paleocurrent measurements from the overlying Espinaso Formation exhibit exclusively west-directed sediment transport (Cather et al., 2002) (Figure 10a).

### 4.3 Clast counts

Clast counts in the El Rito Formation confirm the previously documented dominance by quartzite clasts (Figure 10; Logsdon, 1981). In the Tusas Mountains, the El Rito Formation is entirely comprised of quartzite clasts (see Appendix 2). El Rito Formation clast counts in the eastern and western areas are dominated by quartzite as well (Figure 10b). After quartzite, vein quartz is the dominant clast type in the western area. In contrast, meta-rhyolite is the most dominant clast type after quartzite in the eastern area. Sedimentary clasts observed include sandstone, mudstone, conglomerate, and chert.

To the south, the Diamond Tail Formation clast count does not contain a greater variety, but does exhibit a more uniform distribution of clast types (Figure 7) in comparison to clast counts from the El Rito Formation. Vein quartz and quartzite are present in sub-equal proportions with subordinate chert and sandstone/mudstone clasts. Cather et al. (2002) report a dominance of limestone clasts for conglomerates at the base of the Galisteo Formation in the same area (i.e., Hagan area, Figure 3).

### 4.4 Detrital zircon geochronology

#### 4.4.1 Mixing model

Mean Kuiper V values comparing measured samples to modeled mixtures range from 0.07–0.20 (Table 6). These Kuiper V values range from very good to poor (Saylor & Sundell, 2016), but most results generally yield adequate goodness of fit between mixed distributions and sample distribution. We interpret Kuiper V statistics <0.1 as a very good fit, the values in between 0.1 and 0.16 as ranging from good to moderately good, and ≥ 0.17 as a poor

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>YSG</th>
<th>±σ</th>
<th>WM</th>
<th>±σ</th>
<th>YC1σ (≥2)</th>
<th>±σ</th>
<th>YC2σ (≥3)</th>
<th>±σ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RWRT2</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>±1.2</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>±0.8</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>±0.7</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COB11</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>±1.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>±0.7</td>
<td>no useful population</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>±0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB001</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>±0.6</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>±0.7</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>±1.0</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>±0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3HBPS71</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>±1.6</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>±0.9</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>±0.6</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>±0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1HBPS325</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>±4.0</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>±1.4</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>±1.5</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>±1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1HBPS10</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>±3.6</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>±1.8</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>±2.3</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>±1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: WM, weighted mean of three youngest grains; YC1σ (≥2), youngest cluster of ≥2 grains with overlapping 1σ uncertainty; YC2σ (≥3), youngest cluster of ≥3 grains with overlapping 2σ uncertainty; YSG, youngest single zircon.
fit. We report the source proportions and uncertainties based on the mean and standard deviation of the top 100 (0.1%) models ranked by V value. Uncertainties calculated in this way may approach the mean source proportions, particularly when source proportions are small. Our approach to interpreting mixture model results is to look for general trends, focus on larger source groups, disregard single source groups that exhibit low proportions and relatively high uncertainties, and incorporate multiple methods of detrital zircon data interpretation such as visual comparison of graphic representations and age range comparison.

### 4.4.2 El Rito depocenter: Eastern and western study areas

Detrital zircon U-Pb age distributions from the base and top of the El Rito Formation show an upsection decrease in Cenozoic, Neoproterozoic, and Mesoproterozoic zircons accompanied by an increase in Paleoproterozoic (~1.7 Ga) zircon ages (Figure 11a–d). Samples from the lower El Rito Formation exhibit three subequal Proterozoic age modes (~1.7, ~1.4, and ~1.1 Ga), whereas samples from the upper El Rito Formation contain a dominant mode at ~1.7 Ga. Basal samples also contain larger proportions of younger (≤ 250 Ma, RWRT2 n = 46 and COB11 n = 12) detrital zircon ages than upper samples (RWRT40 n = 7 and 2ACRT40 n = 7). The basal sample (RWRT2) contains a notable population of Cenozoic zircons (n = 23), with a single-grain minimum age of 33.8 ± 1.2 (1σ) Ma, whereas the upper sample (RWRT40) contains only three Cenozoic zircons (YSG = 35.7 ± 1.3 (1σ) Ma). Eastern samples show similar results to those from the western area, but contain significantly fewer Cenozoic ages. Sample COB11 contains three Cenozoic zircons, with a minimum single-grain age of 37.6 ± 1.3 (1σ) Ma. Sample 2ACRT40 contains no ages younger than 100 Ma; the youngest detrital zircon age is 149.7 ± 6.25 (1σ) Ma. We present multiple methods of determining MDAs for samples that contain sufficient Cenozoic ages (Figure 8, Table 5), but rely on YSG method because of the relatively low number of analyzed grains (Coutts et al., 2019).

Relative source contributions yielded by DZmix modelling are consistent with qualitative observations described above. These results indicate that younger source groups (Triassic strata through Cretaceous–Cenozoic magmatic arc) provided most of the detritus for the basal El Rito Formation, whereas the Ortega Quartzite is the dominant source for the upper El Rito Formation (Figure 11a and c). Western and eastern samples from the basal El Rito Formation suggest different sourcing: the western sample is dominated by recycled Mesozoic eolianite and magmatic arc groups whereas the eastern sample indicates recycled early Cretaceous sourcing (Figure 11b and d). Kuiper V values for El Rito Formation samples and source profiles 1 and 1_SJ range from 0.09 to 0.016 (Table 6). Comparison of modeled and sample cumulative distribution functions (see Appendix 5) suggest that the primary mismatch is between sample Mesozoic–Cenozoic zircon populations and magmatic arc source attribution within the model. As with all samples analyzed in this study, the poorest model fits correspond to samples that contain the largest populations of Cenozoic zircons, indicating that we did not adequately characterize this source.

### 4.4.3 Galisteo depocenter

Detrital zircon samples collected in this study that span the lower Diamond Tail through upper Galisteo formations, and previously published data from the Espinaso Formation (Sharman, Covault, Stockli, Wroblewski, & Bush, 2016) contain variable Cretaceous–Cenozoic zircon populations (Figure 11e–i). The lower and upper Diamond Tail formations contain few Cenozoic zircons (n = 2 for each), but their youngest single grain ages (62.3 ± 3.6 (1σ) and 54.9 ± 4.0 (1σ) Ma, respectively) are consistent with Paleocene–early Eocene depositional ages (Cather, 2004; Lucas et al., 1997). The lower Galisteo Formation records an increase in Mesozoic age proportion (25%) over both Diamond Tail Formation samples, but only contains one Cenozoic age zircon, which is older than the youngest age from the upper Diamond Tail Formation and so is not used as a depositional age. In contrast, two zircons from the upper Galisteo Formation sample yield ages of ~38 Ma (YSG = 38.4 ± 1.6 (1σ) Ma) and the youngest detrital zircon in the Espinaso
Formation is 32.4 ± 0.6 (1σ) Ma (Table 5). All five samples exhibit multi-modal age distributions with varying modal proportions (Figure 11e–i). The most notable of these changes is the dearth of Cenozoic zircons in the lower three samples and the contrasting prevalence of this population in upper Galisteo Formation (3HBPS71 $n = 23$). The Espinaso Formation sample reported by Sharman et al. (2016) was collected ~23 km northeast of the other Galisteo depocenter samples presented here (i.e., from the Hagan area, Figure 3), and contains fewer Cenozoic zircons ($n = 6$) than the upper Galisteo Formation sample. This is unexpected given the formation’s commonly observed volcanioclastic character and its interpreted volcanic source (Kautz et al., 1981; Lisenbee, 2013; Smith et al., 1991; Stearns, 1953), which suggests significant variability in the abundance of volcanic detritus within the Espinaso Formation.

There are significant changes in detrital zircon age populations across the unconformity which separates the Diamond Tail and Galisteo formations. One change is the disappearance of a notable ~500 Ma mode (Figure 11h–g). The two samples documenting the disappearance of this age mode (1HBPS325 and 1HBPS351) are separated by less than 30 m of stratigraphic section (Figure 7). There is a notable decrease in the relative proportions of the ~1.7 Ga to ~1.4 Ga age groups and an increase in ~1.1 Ga age group across the unconformity. However, the change in proportions of Proterozoic ages is short-lived and modal proportions in the upper Galisteo Formation sample are similar to those in the Diamond Tail Formation (Figure 11g and f). The Espinaso Formation contains similar Proterozoic age groups, but with subequal ~1.4 and ~1.7 Ga age modes. Finally, Paleozoic and Neoproterozoic age groups decrease from the lower Galisteo Formation through the Espinaso Formation.

The addition of the San Jose Formation conditional source group to source profile 1 (i.e., source profile 1_SJ; Figure 4) improved four out of five of the Galisteo depocenter sample mixture model results by decreasing their V statistics by an average of 0.021 (Table 6). In models with improved V statistics (i.e., lower and upper Diamond Tail, lower Galisteo,
and Espinaso formations), the San Jose Formation source group contributes 25% to 51% (Figure 11e, and g–i). Western Paleozoic and basement source groups constitute a significant portion of these models except for the lower Galisteo Formation. Instead, the lower Galisteo model shows low basement contribution and a correlative increase in Jurassic and Early Cretaceous source groups (Figure 11g). The upper Galisteo model fit is poor and statistically the same for both source group profiles 1 and 1_SJ. The model for this sample also indicates insignificant contribution from the San Jose Formation source group and exhibits significant magmatic arc sourcing (Figure 11f).

### 4.4.4 | Gulf of Mexico

Paleocene–Oligocene detrital zircon data are compiled from 18 samples from the paleo Colorado-Brazos fluvial system (Figure 2a, see Table 7 for references), and separated into 6 stratigraphic intervals: the early Paleocene Midway Group, the middle Paleocene lower Wilcox Group, the late Paleocene middle Wilcox Group, the early Eocene upper Wilcox Group, middle Eocene Claiborne Group, and early Oligocene Vicksburg/Frio Group. Detrital zircon spectra from five of six stratigraphic intervals exhibit similar proportions of Proterozoic populations at ~1.1, ~1.4, and ~1.7 Ga. Similarly, these data also contain a significant proportion of Mesozoic ages, with an upsection increase in both Mesozoic and Cenozoic age zircons (Figure 11j and K-O). In contrast, the middle Eocene Claiborne Group is dominated by ~1.1 Ga zircons, and contains fewer Mesozoic or Cenozoic ages than any other Gulf of Mexico sample presented here (Figure 11k).

Between the middle Wilcox and Vicksburg/Frio groups there are two significant changes in mixing model results (Figure 11l–j). The first is a decrease in western Paleozoic source and increase magmatic arc source between the middle and upper Wilcox Group. The upper Wilcox Group is the poorest fit of any models (V statistic = 0.2) indicating that no combination of potential sources adequately characterizes this stratigraphic interval. The second is the unique detrital zircon age distribution of the Claiborne Group sample, which also yielded poor model fits with our default source groups (V statistic = 0.17). However, when the conditional Appalachian source group was added as a potential sediment source (i.e., source profile 1_App, and source profile 1_App+SJ; Table 6), the Kuiper V value dropped to 0.08 while attributing ~65% of sourcing to the Appalachian group (Figure 11k). Conversely, the Appalachian source group is effectively absent from all other units. Finally, the Vicksburg/Frio Group model results return to similar pre-upper Wilcox Group proportions, while also yielding a 0.13 Kuiper V value.

### Table 6

Kuiper V values for El Rito and Galisteo depocenters, and Gulf of Mexico samples for DZmix model runs for source profile 1 and both conditional source profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depocenter</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Source profile 1</th>
<th>Source profile 1_SJ</th>
<th>Source profile 1_App</th>
<th>Source profile 1_App+SJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V value 1σ</td>
<td>V value 1σ</td>
<td>V value 1σ</td>
<td>V value 1σ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Rito</td>
<td>RWRT40</td>
<td>0.125 ±0.003</td>
<td>0.125 ±0.003</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RWRT2</td>
<td>0.159 ±0.006</td>
<td>0.161 ±0.009</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2ACRT40</td>
<td>0.101 ±0.004</td>
<td>0.105 ±0.004</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COB11</td>
<td>0.09 ±0.002</td>
<td>0.094 ±0.004</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galisteo</td>
<td>GB001</td>
<td>0.134 ±0.003</td>
<td>0.117 ±0.004</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3HBPS71</td>
<td>0.169 ±0.003</td>
<td>0.166 ±0.002</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1HBPS351</td>
<td>0.114 ±0.003</td>
<td>0.088 ±0.003</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1HBPS325</td>
<td>0.112 ±0.005</td>
<td>0.101 ±0.005</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1HBPS10</td>
<td>0.101 ±0.005</td>
<td>0.072 ±0.005</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf of Mexico</td>
<td>Vicksburg/Frio</td>
<td>0.132 ±0.000</td>
<td>0.132 ±0.000</td>
<td>0.132 ±0.000</td>
<td>0.132 ±0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Claiborne</td>
<td>0.166 ±0.001</td>
<td>0.17 ±0.001</td>
<td>0.075 ±0.000</td>
<td>0.076 ±0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>up Wilcox</td>
<td>0.203 ±0.000</td>
<td>0.202 ±0.001</td>
<td>0.203 ±0.000</td>
<td>0.202 ±0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mid Wilcox</td>
<td>0.101 ±0.002</td>
<td>0.098 ±0.001</td>
<td>0.101 ±0.001</td>
<td>0.100 ±0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>low Wilcox</td>
<td>0.084 ±0.002</td>
<td>0.084 ±0.004</td>
<td>0.094 ±0.004</td>
<td>0.090 ±0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midway Gp.</td>
<td>0.096 ±0.004</td>
<td>0.92 ±0.002</td>
<td>0.095 ±0.004</td>
<td>0.093 ±0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RG up Wilcox</td>
<td>0.128 ±0.000</td>
<td>0.124 ±0.004</td>
<td>0.129 ±0.001</td>
<td>0.125 ±0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>low Wilcox</td>
<td>0.170 ±0.004</td>
<td>0.172 ±0.002</td>
<td>0.170 ±0.004</td>
<td>0.171 ±0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviation: Gp., Group.
FIGURE 11 PDPs, DZmix calculated relative source proportions, and Cenozoic and Mesozoic populations for new and published Paleogene detrital zircon U-Pb data. Sample metadata is provided in Tables 4 and 7. The dashed lines in B and F are PDPs of that sample with the Cenozoic relative proportions (j–q) are calculated from source 1_App+SJ. Further detail of DZmix models is provided in Appendix 5. Numbers in relative source proportion columns are the Kuiper V statistic for the respective sample (Table 6). Names for El Rito and Galisteo depocenter samples commonly used in text, tables, figures, and appendices: A.-RWRT40, B.-RWRT2, C.-COB11, D.-2ACRT40, E.-GB001, F.-3HBPS71, G.-1HBPS351, H.-1HBPS325, I.-1HBPS10. E., early; Eoc., Eocene; Fm., Formation; Gp., Group; l., late; Olig., Oligocene; Pal., Paleocene; Vicksb., Vicksburg.

Modeling source groups with the addition of the San Jose Formation source (i.e., source profile 1_SJ, and source profile 1_App+SJ: Table 6) produced similar results to source group 1 for Gulf of Mexico detrital zircon samples. Source profile 1_App+SJ mixing model results for Gulf of Mexico samples are consistent with the Galisteo depocenter model results (Figure 11).

Late Paleocene to earliest Eocene Rio Grande samples collected from the upper and lower Wilcox Group (Mackey, Horton, & Milliken, 2012) were compiled from 4 samples each and exhibit similar Proterozoic proportions described above for paleo Colorado-Brazos samples (excluding the Claiborne Group data). The Rio Grande data also contain significant Mesozoic populations (Figure 11p and Q, 40% and 37%, respectively). Mixture model results for source group 1_App+SJ indicate an upsection increase, from lower to upper Wilcox Group, in magmatic arc and San Jose Formation sources, while also exhibiting minor decreases in Mesozoic source groups. The mixing model closeness of fit for the paleo Rio Grande is consistently poor (V statistic = 0.17) for the lower Wilcox Group, and moderately good (V statistic = 0.12–0.13) for the upper Wilcox Group across all models (Table 6). These results indicate that our sources poorly characterize the Rio Grande’s lower Wilcox Formation, and that the fluvial system feeding the San Jose Formation also may have contributed sediment the Rio Grande catchment during lower Wilcox deposition.

5 | DISCUSSION

5.1 | Sediment provenance

We make several general observations regarding application of DZmix to the detrital zircon data presented here.
Modelling provided insights into provenance changes that were not discernible through visual inspection of detrital zircon spectra (e.g., Galisteo depocenter provenance change across the inter‐formational unconformity, Figure 11). Furthermore, mixture modelling provided a quantitative tool to differentiate source contribution between source spectra that share similar ages and proportions (e.g., Jurassic, Mesozoic eolianites, and Appalachian source groups). (b) Mixture modelling serves as a useful tool to refine potential source groups through iterative model runs and revisions to source profiles. (c) Modifying source groups yields insight into potential source variability, but is valid only when supported by independent geological observations. We found it useful to limit the number of source groups in the compilation, while still capturing the appropriate level of source diversity, and to balance that with as much consistency as possible across different depocenters. The modification of source profile 1 with two conditional source groups (i.e., source profile 1_SJ, source profile 1_App, and source 1_App+SJ) addresses these considerations.

### 5.2 Age of the El Rito Formation

Detrital zircon MDAs indicate a latest Eocene–earliest Oligocene age for the El Rito Formation (Table 5), and provide a basis for regional correlations. Precise age assignment of the El Rito Formation has been problematic (Cather, 2004; Logsdon, 1981; Lucas, 1984; Lucas & Ingersoll, 1981), relying on “event stratigraphy” (Ager, 1973; Lucas, 1984), upper and lower bounding unconformities (Galusha & Blick, 1971; Lucas, 1984), or tenuous correlation to adjacent formations (Logsdon, 1981; Lucas, 1984; Lucas & Ingersoll, 1981; Yin & Ingersoll, 1997). The YSG for the basal western sample is 33.8 ± 1.2 (1σ) Ma in comparison to 37.6 ± 1.3 (1σ) Ma for the basal eastern sample, suggesting a westward delay in the onset of sedimentation between the eastern and western study areas (Figure 5). Although other methods of calculating MDA produce slightly older results for both samples, they consistently point to a latest Eocene–early Oligocene MDA with the onset of deposition at eastern area initiating 3–4 M.y. earlier than in the western area (Table 5, Figure 8). We prefer the YSG method for the samples presented here due to the low number of Paleogene age zircons, any one of which is probabilistically most likely to represent the modal age of a Gaussian distribution of ages approximating the depositional age (Coutts et al., 2019). The age of ~34 Ma for the basal El Rito Formation is consistent with a 32.3 ± 3.2 (1σ) youngest single grain MDA of the El Rito Formation in the Tusas Mountains (Donahue, 2016). However, these ages significantly revise the previously assigned early Eocene age for the basal El Rito Formation (Baltz, 1978; Logsdon, 1981; Lucas, 1984; Lucas & Ingersoll, 1981; Yin & Ingersoll, 1997) and have significant implications for its relationship to the Galisteo Formation (see Basin synthesis discussion below).

### 5.3 El Rito depocenter: Sedimentological & stratigraphic trends

Provenance, paleocurrent, and lithofacies changes in the El Rito Formation consistently point to an upsection change...
from a southward-flowing braided fluvial system fed by eastward-flowing tributaries and confined within narrow incised topography to a southward-flowing meandering river in a broad, intermontane alluvial plain (Figure 12b and c insets). The eastern and western measured sections both record upward-finig fluvial sequences with quartzite-clast-dominated, braided stream deposition at their base and sandy meandering stream deposition at the top. In the upper interval, the western section exhibits multiple well-developed paleosol intervals that contain pervasive terrestrial burrows (Figures 5 and 9b). These extended periods of pedogenic development are interpreted to have occurred during infilling of the BSC and NGA incised intermontane valley system, and were accompanied by a decrease in fluvial energy. Above this interval, channel sandstones exhibit evidence of lateral migration and flood plain cannibalization. Further change is indicated by paleocurrent indicators rotating from east-directed at the base of the western measured section to south- and west-directed in the upper portion of the section. At both measured section locations, an upsection switch from dominantly Mesozoic- to basement-derived detrital zircons is observed (Figure 11a–d). We interpret the basal El Rito unconformity and upsection changes in stratigraphy and provenance to chronicle the exhumation of the NGA Uplift and its subsequent waning influence over sedimentation in the El Rito depocenter by the late Eocene–early Oligocene. Furthermore, although not coeval with El Rito provenance trends, there is a similar upsection shift observed above the Diamond Tail-Galisteo unconformity where Mesozoic recycled sourcing is replaced by western Paleozoic and basement sources between the lower and upper Galisteo Formation (Figure 11g–f).

Provenance differences between the eastern and western study areas’ lowermost samples in the El Rito depocenter point to subtly different source signatures, which give way upsection to a more uniform combination of sources. The greatest difference between the two locations of basal El Rito Formation detrital zircon data is the higher proportion of Mesozoic and Cenozoic zircons from the western compared to the eastern samples (Figure 11a–d). West-to-east and upsection decreases in Mesozoic and Cenozoic age zircons observed in the El Rito Formation are consistent with western-sourced zircons of these age groups which diminish in relative contribution through time. The upsection decrease in abundance of Mesozoic zircons is interpreted to reflect a diminishing of recycled Mesozoic strata mantling the NGA Uplift to the west. The upsection decrease in Cenozoic zircons suggests restriction of the El Rito catchment as it became isolated from increasingly proximal volcanic activity (Chapin et al., 2004).

The dominance of quartzite clasts in lower El Rito Formation conglomerates appears to contradict the detrital zircon results which suggest recycled Mesozoic source dominance within the same stratigraphic interval. However, the presence of these conglomerates (Figures 5 and 10b) provides insight into the source of quartzite gravels, and why they are associated with recycled Mesozoic gravels. The absence of Proterozoic quartzite bedrock in the NGA Uplift (to the west) and its exposure in the BSC Uplift (to the east) (Jones et al., 2009) suggests that the quartzite gravels, at least in the east-flowing feeders, are recycled. An early Eocene, alluvial fan complex is proposed to have sourced the San Juan Basin from the BSC Uplift (Lucas, 1984). This alluvial fan would have partially mantled the incipient NGA Uplift and El Rito depocenter (Figure 13), and tapped basement lithologies exposed in the BSC Uplift (Baltz, 1967; Brister, 1992; Smith, 1992).

We interpret the apparent provenance discrepancy between conglomerate clast counts and zircon geochronology in the lower El Rito Formation to reflect the relative mechanical robustness of quartzite clasts recycled from Eocene alluvial fan complex during exhumation of the NGA Uplift compared to the easily disaggregated Mesozoic strata stripped off the crest and eastern flank of the uplift.

West-flowing basement-clast conglomerates are preserved in the Llaves Member of the San Jose Formation (Smith, 1992), and are considered to be a northern example of a similar BSC-sourced fan complex as proposed above. However, the lack of coarse-grained detritus, including quartzite gravels, and the dominance of southward paleocurrent indicators in the San Jose Formation directly adjacent to the Nacimiento Uplift (Cather, 1992; Figure 10a) provide a maximum westward limit for the proposed alluvial fan. One possibility is that the quartzite alluvial fan that partially mantled the NGA Uplift transitioned into a finer grained fluvial system somewhere along the eastern flank of the incipient uplift as it was integrated into the well documented San Jose fluvial system. Another possibility is that earlier movement along the NGA Uplift (Baltz, 1967; Woodward, 1987) created a minor, but persistent drainage divide between the San Juan Basin and a precursor El Rito depocenter (Cather, 2004). The main phase of NGA exhumation (early Eocene) subsequently removed this stratigraphic record. Further detrital zircon work in the San Jose Formation may provide data to discriminate between the two models discussed above.

5.4  |  Galisteo depocenter

Youngest single grain MDAs in the Galisteo depocenter are consistent with previously reported age control in these formations. For the basal and upper Diamond Tail Formation, YSGs (62.3 ± 3.6 (1σ) Ma and 54.9 ± 4.0 (1σ) Ma, respectively) match with rare mammalian fossils found in the middle of the formation that indicate early Eocene deposition (Lucas, 1982; Lucas & Williamson, 1993; Lucas et al., 1997). The same early Eocene fossils are also identified in
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the base of Galisteo Formation indicating that the interven-
ing lacuna lasted no longer than 6 M.y. (Figure 13; Cather,
2004; Woodburne & Swisher, 1995). The age of the upper

Galisteo Formation is ~38 Ma based on magnetostratigraphy
(Prothero & Lucas, 1996). This is consistent with detrital
zircon MDA from the upper Galisteo Formation (38.4 ± 1.6
(1σ) Ma, Table 6, Figure 8).

Provenance proxies provide insight into the nature of
drainage reorganization across the basin-wide unconfor-
mity between the Diamond Tail and Galisteo formations in
the Galisteo depocenter. Conglomerates directly above the
unconformity contain a higher diversity of lithologies (e.g.,
sandstone, limestone, chert, granite, and quartzite) in com-
parison to the underlying Diamond Tail Formation (Cather
et al., 2002; Gorham & Ingersoll, 1979). We attribute this
increased clast variability to tectonic rejuvenation of NGA
and portions of the BSC uplifts.

The change in detrital zircon age spectra, particularly the
loss of the ~500 Ma age mode (Figure 11g to h), between
the upper Diamond Tail and lower Galisteo formations is

FIGURE 12 Three stage tectonic reconstruction of north-
central New Mexico integrates local drainage changes within
regional drainage networks (modified from Blum et al., 2017). (a)
Late Paleocene and earliest Eocene fluvial networks that predate
the primary phase of NGA rock and surface uplift, and exhumation
(incipient position indicated by dashed grey line). This river system
was sourced from a combination of northern (BSC Uplift) and western
(San Juan Basin) sources and fed the paleo Colorado-Brazos River. (b)
Following NGA exhumation and development of the inter-formational
unconformity in the Galisteo depocenter in the early Eocene,
deposition recommenced in the Galisteo depocenter. Upstream, erosion
continued, resulting in formation of the high-relief basal unconformity
of the El Rito Formation. The inset block diagram illustrates this
bedrock river in the general vicinity of Red Wash Canyon and Arroyo
del Cobre. Ortega Quartzite gravel was recycled from the west-flowing
sediment transport systems illustrated in a). (c) Cessation of rock
and surface uplift, and waning exhumation of the NGA resulted in
decreased fluvial gradients, northward onlap by fluvial sediment
into the incised topography, broadening of the fluvial system, and
transition from gravel-dominated braided rivers to sand-dominated
meandering rivers (shown in the block diagram). Dashed gray lines in
the northern depocenter indicate buried incised topography. Arrow for
the Tch indicates modern exposure of that formation, which is slightly
west of map boundaries. Uplifts and faults: TCF- Tijeras Cañoncito
fault system, BSC- Brazos-Sangre de Cristo, NGA-Nacimiento-
Gallina-Archeleta, Lu-Lucero, Mi-Morenzi, Mo-Montosa. Formations
organized by depocenter: El Rito depocenter: Je- Entrada Formation,
TCh-Chinite Formation, Te-El Rito Formation; Galisteo depocenter:
Tdt-Diamond Tail Formation, Tg- Galisteo Formation, Tes-Espiaso
Formation; San Juan Basin: Tsj-San Jose Formation, Tbb- Blanco
Basin Formation, Tch-Chuska Formation; Monte Vista Basin: Tbb-
Blanco Basin Formation, Tco-Conejos Formation; Baca and Carthage
La-Joya Basins: Tb- Baca Formation, Ts- Spears Formation. Uplift
Schematic fluvial pathways adapted from Cather (2004). Faults
modified from Cather (2004) and Lisenbee (2013). Volcanic activity
after Chapin et al. (2004)
FIGURE 13 Chronostratigraphy, dominant lithologies, and interpreted source contributions for the El Rito depocenter, Galisteo depocenter, and the northwest margin of the Gulf of Mexico with approximate separation distances annotated between. Paleocurrent rose diagrams from Figure 10a are displayed in the appropriate stratigraphic position for the El Rito and Galisteo depocenter. Interpreted source contributions are created from modification of source contribution and young zircon population percentages presented in Figure 11 and illustrated in the figure key. Cenozoic volcanic rock interpreted source group is generated from the percentage of Cenozoic zircon population (Figure 11), which is subtracted from the magmatic arc group. The Espinaso Formation presents the one exception (indicated by the *) to this method as the percentage of Cenozoic zircons (6%) were greater than the magmatic arc source group attribution (3%). In this specific case we attribute the entire magmatic arc proportion to the Cenozoic volcanic zircon group, and allocate the remaining 3% from San Jose Formation source group. The depositional hiatus between the Diamond Tail and Galisteo formations is indicated by a gap in the source group interpretation column. Age control and facies information are provided by data presented herein and previously published data: Kautz et al. (1981), Lucas (1982), Kay (1986), Lucas and Williamson (1993), Woodburne and Swisher (1995), Prothero and Lucas (1996), Cather (2004), Maldonado and Kelley (2009), Lisenbee (2013), Cohen, Finney, Gibbard, and Fan (2013). Fm., Formation; Gp., Group; GoM., Gulf of Mexico; M., middle; L., lower; U., upper.
indicative of tectonically-driven drainage reorganization (Figure 12a and b). We interpret the most likely source of ~500 Ma detrital zircons to be from the north or southeast. To the north, the Wet Mountains consistently supplied ~500 Ma zircons to the Huerfano Basin throughout the Paleocene and Eocene (Rasmussen & Foreman, 2017). It is possible that this drainage system also supplied ~500 Ma zircons to the Diamond Tail Formation via southwestward-flowing streams that were diverted after NGA exhumation. Alternatively, ~500 Ma zircons may have been sourced by late Cambrian–early Ordovician age igneous rocks of the Lobo and Pedernal hills (McMillan & McLemore, 2001), which are located ~50 and ~75 kilometers to the southeast, respectively (Figure 2). In either case, the disappearance of the ~500 Ma age mode indicates cessation of sedimentation from the north or southeast, and replacement by western-sourced rivers. The change in sediment sourcing was coeval with large-scale mass wasting (Figure 9e) and development of a regional unconformity at the base of the Galisteo Formation collectively supports the interpretation of tectonically driven drainage reorganization.

Similarities in provenance trends above the Diamond Tail-Galisteo unconformity and basal El Rito unconformity suggest that the two areas were affected by the same episode of tectonic activity: exhumation of the NGA Uplift. In both cases the Mesozoic source disappears or diminishes upslope, and is replaced by a source dominated by ~1.7 Ga zircon ages (primarily the Ortega Quartzite; Figures 4 and 11a–d, g, and f). The Mesozoic source is attributed to unroofing of Mesozoic formations during early-middle Eocene exhumation of the NGA Uplift (Figure 10a and b). The consistent San Jose Formation source group proportion observed through the Diamond Tail and lower Galisteo formations suggests a steady influence of this river system until deposition of the upper Galisteo Formation when the San Jose Formation source was almost completely replaced by magmatic arc source (Figure 11f). We interpret the increase in Cenozoic age zircons to account for the poor fit of magmatic arc source attribution (V statistic = 0.17) and to indicate local volcanic source contribution (Figures 12c and 13).

The Espinaso Formation records a westerly shift in paleocurrent indicators, which is attributed to a shift in fluvial gradients driven by the growth of the volcanic Ortiz Mountains and Cerrillos Hills to the east (Figures 3 and 12c). This is consistent with an increase in Picuris Orogenic granitoid source (~1.4 Ga), which is interpreted as basement sourced sediment from the BSC Uplift (e.g., Bush et al., 2016), while renewed of the San Jose Formation source group is best explained by recycling of Eocene fluvial sediments. The approximately 180° shift in paleoflow direction in the Hagan area (Figure 10a) and the relatively low abundance of Cenozoic volcanic-sourced detrital zircons to the north (Figures 3 and 11e) despite proximate development of at least two large volcanoes (Kautz et al., 1981) suggest that the Espinaso Formation was deposited during a time of drainage reorganization and expansion of highly localized catchments. Local changes in drainage networks most likely pushed the Colorado-Brazos River farther south than its position during the deposition of the Galisteo Formation. These drainage dynamics may have also exerted effects on deposition within the El Rito depocenter by affecting hydraulic gradients at the mouth of its fluvial corridor.

5.5 | Tectonic subsidence versus cut-and-fill accommodation of intermontane basins

Multiple lines of evidence support a tectonically-induced subsidence mechanism for the Galisteo depocenter. Diamond Tail and Galisteo stratigraphy thicken southwestward towards the Tijeras-Cañoncito fault system, and strike-oriented (northeast) paleocurrent indicators suggest that the fault zone exerted control over drainage patterns in the basin (Lisenbee, 2013). Paleocene kinematics along the Tijeras-Cañoncito fault system are obscured by prior and subsequent fault motion (Lisenbee, 2013). The specific mechanism of basin subsidence in this area is debated (i.e., transtensional vs. synclinal sag; Cather, 1992; Yin & Ingersoll, 1997, respectively), but stratigraphic thickness, basin geometry, proximity to the active Tijeras-Cañoncito fault system, and occurrence of mass-transport complexes directly beneath the Galisteo Formation basal unconformity (Figure 9e) support tectonic subsidence as the primary driver of accommodation in the Galisteo depocenter.

In contrast, the available geochronology, stratigraphy, and mapping indicates that accommodation for the El Rito Formation was created by tectonically-induced incision, rather than tectonic subsidence. The full thickness of the El Rito Formation in both Arroyo del Cobre and Red Wash Canyon area was deposited within the relief of the formation’s basal unconformity (Figure 5). The El Rito Formation onlaps this high-relief basin unconformity (Figure 9c) suggesting a cut-and-fill accommodation mechanism for the El Rito Formation. Cut-and-fill accommodation is commonly found in intermontane basins (Hilley & Strecker, 2005), but until now, has not been invoked to explain preservation of the El Rito Formation.

5.6 | Laramide tectonics & geodynamics

We attribute the unconformity beneath the El Rito and Galisteo formations, and subsequent basin evolution, to the final stage of Laramide deformation. Initial movement of the NGA Uplift was minor and commenced in the Campanian (~78–75 Ma) based on thinning of the Lewis Shale across the Archuleta Anticlinorium (Cather, 2004; Gries, Clayton, & Leonard, 1997) and the thinning or absence of the ~75 Ma Pictured Cliffs Sandstone across the Nacimiento Uplift.
accommodation, the increasing magnitude and punctuated deformation described herein, renewed Laramide basin rollback (Coney & Reynolds, 1977; Copeland et al., 2017; Cather et al., 2003) coincident with proposed timing of initiation of Farallon slab erosion (Cather et al., 2003) (Figure 12b). The timing of north-central New Mexico rollback (Coney & Reynolds, 1977; Copeland et al., 2017; Cather, 2004; Woodburne & Swisher, 1995) hiatus recorded between the Galisteo and Diamond Tail formations. This interpretation is consistent with timing of Nacimiento deformation observed in stratigraphic and structural relationships (Baltz, 1967; Woodward, 1987) as well as Eocene apatite fission track ages (Kelley et al., 1992).

The BSC Uplift was also active in the early Eocene, potentially experiencing exhumation coincident with and structurally linked to the NGA Uplift. The asymmetric basin geometry and eastward thickening of the Galisteo depocenter supports syndepositional tectonic activity along the eastern margin of the depocenter (Lisenbee, 2013). Further, dominant basement-clast cobble-boulder conglomerates, in some exposures of the Galisteo Formation (e.g., outcrops at St. Peter’s Dome; Cather, 1992) support uplift of the BSC directly preceding or during Galisteo deposition. Along the eastern margin of the BSC Uplift, east-directed thrusting and folding affected early Eocene rocks of the Raton Basin (Cather, 2004; Johnson, 1959). This activity along the eastern and western margins of the BSC Uplift, in concert with NGA exhumation, are part of the terminal phase of Laramide tectonic activity.

Basins other than the Galisteo depocenter along the margin of the Laramide province were actively capturing sediment in the early to middle Eocene, reflecting a renewed episode of tectonic activity. Coarse-grained sediment was sequestered during this late stage of Laramide tectonic activity and preserved in the Denver Basin (Raynolds, 2002; Soister & Tschudy, 1978), Monte Vista Basin (Brister & Chapin, 1994), Echo Park Basin (Chapin & Cather, 1981), South Park Basin (Beggs, 1977; Chapin & Cather, 1983), Baca Basin (Cather, 2004), Carthage-La Joya Basin (Cather, 2009), Sierra Blanca Basin (Cather, 2009), and up to 1 km of strata in the San Juan Basin that has been subsequently eroded (Cather et al., 2003) (Figure 12b). This final phase of Laramide-style deformation is coincident with proposed timing of initiation of Farallon slab rollback (Coney & Reynolds, 1977; Copeland et al., 2017; Dickinson & Snyder, 1978; Smith, Carroll, Jicha, Cassel, & Scott, 2014). The timing of north-central New Mexico deformation described herein, renewed Laramide basin accommodation, the increasing magnitude and punctuated nature of NGA associated deformation, and the subsequent increase in volcanic detritus observed in the upper Galisteo and Espinaso formations are consistent with models of multi-stage Laramide deformation during slab rollback (Cather, 2004; Chapin & Cather, 1983; Fan & Carrapa, 2014; Liu & Gurnis, 2010). These models point to accelerated upper plate deformation and westward migration of arc magmatism, and invoke upwelling of mantle and weakening of the North American plate due to slab rollback (Constenius, 1996; Fan & Carrapa, 2014; Humphreys et al., 2003).

5.7 | Basin Synthesis

We distill the proposed sequence of Paleogene tectonically-driven depositional events into three stages (Figure 12a–c). This synthesis proposes that tectonic activity along the NGA and potentially BSC uplifts drove local drainage reorganization and erosion that created the basal unconformity of the El Rito and Galisteo formations. Erosional truncation of underlying strata was followed by renewed subsidence in the south, and northward onlap of fluvial facies onto the unconformity. We interpret these stages within the context of proposed Paleogene transcontinental fluvial systems that drained into the Gulf of Mexico (Blum et al., 2017; Galloway et al., 2011).

5.7.1 | Stage 1: late Paleocene–earliest Eocene

During the late Paleocene and earliest Eocene, the headwaters of paleo Colorado-Brazos River occupied the future site of the El Rito and Galisteo depocenters (Blum et al., 2017; Galloway et al., 2011; Figure 12a). A fluvial system with a broad catchment and flowing through the San Juan Basin (Cather, 1992) delivered sediment to the Galisteo Basin during Diamond Tail deposition. The Llaves Member of the San Jose Formation records west-directed paleoflow and base-sourced, gravel-dominated deposition (Smith, 1992), and lies to the north of the incipient NGA Uplift. Although not preserved in the rock record, similar alluvial fans extended south along the western flank of the BSC Uplift, tapping Ortega Quartzite, and partially mantling the incipient NGA Uplift (Lucas, 1984). Local tectonic activity in the early Eocene drove formation of the unconformity that truncates the top Diamond Tail Formation and marks the end of Stage 1. Specifically, exhumation of the NGA Uplift, and renewed activity along the BSC Uplift and Tijeras-Cañoncito fault systems, induced subaerial mass wasting events recorded during the uppermost Diamond Tail Formation (Figure 9e), and resulted in development of a broad, regional unconformity at the base of the Galisteo and El Rito formations.
5.7.2 | Stage 2: early–middle Eocene

Resumption of sediment capture and deposition of the Galisteo Formation in the Galisteo depocenter marks the start of Stage 2 (Figure 12b). The increase in recycled Mesozoic material from the recently exhumed NGA Uplift and disappearance of the ~500 Ma detrital zircon mode indicate drainage reorganization across the basal Galisteo unconformity. Although deposition resumed in the Galisteo depocenter, our depositional chronology for the El Rito Formation indicates that the El Rito depocenter remained a zone of bypass or incision during Stage 2.

Return of accommodation in the Galisteo depocenter is mirrored by other Laramide basins around north-central New Mexico that also captured sediment during this stage. Although an unconformity in the San Juan Basin removed middle Eocene stratigraphy, approximately 1 km of middle Eocene-early Oligocene sedimentary rock is proposed to have been eroded (Cather et al., 2003). Fluvial to alluvial fan facies of the Blanco Basin Formation were deposited in newly developed Monte Vista Basin along the eastern margin of the San Juan Basin (Brister, 1992; Brister & Chapin, 1994) (Figure 12b). Fluvial and lacustrine facies of the Baca Formation were deposited in the Carthage-La Joya and Baca Basins (Cather, 2004) (Figure 12b).

The end of stage 2 is marked by the gradual increase of volcanic activity and volcaniclastic sediment capture in the region, the gradational transition from Galisteo Formation to Espinaso Formation deposition, and northward expansion of fluvial deposition from the Galisteo depocenter into the El Rito depocenter.

5.7.3 | Stage 3: late Eocene–early Oligocene

In the late Eocene, decreased fluvial gradients and sediment-transport capacity in the northern (i.e., El Rito Formation) depocenter resulted in transition from incision or bypass to sediment accumulation, and buried the incised landscape (Figure 12c). During this infilling process the remaining erosion-resistant gravels of Ortega Quartzite filled lower portions of feeder and trunk paleo-valleys. The more ephemeral tributary streams to the west experienced extended periods of pedogenesis following gravel deposition. As the El Rito trunk system aggraded, fluvial gradients decreased, and fluvial systems transitioned from braided to meandering (Schumm, 1981). The sand-dominated, meandering fluvial network was still confined by the incised valley, but the deepest and most constricting parts of the relief had been filled, thereby creating a broader intermontane fluvial plain that trended north-south between the BSC and NGA uplifts (Figure 12c).

MDAs provided by detrital zircons (Table 6, Figure 8) indicate that most, if not all, of the El Rito Formation was deposited while the Espinaso Formation was deposited in the Galisteo depocenter (Figure 12c). The volcanically active Ortiz Mountains and Cerrillos Hills, only several kilometers to the northeast, contributed abundant material to the Espinaso Formation (Kautz et al., 1981) while also receiving significant basement-derived zircons from the BSC Uplift. Despite proximity to active volcanism, the upper El Rito Formation records relatively little volcanic input. The greater abundance of Cenozoic zircons in the western samples suggests that they were delivered to the western reaches of the El Rito catchment via the distal edge of air-fall tuff(s). The dearth of Cenozoic volcanic zircons in the upper El Rito Formation (RWRT40 and 2ACRT40) and proximity to volcanically active locations (Figure 12c) also suggest that the El Rito catchment was topographically isolated from extrabasinal rivers that transported volcanic detritus post-peak tectonic uplift.

Sediment capture in surrounding Laramide depocenters that also sourced the headwaters of the Colorado-Brazos River system persisted during this stage. The Spears Formation in the Baca and Carthage-La Joya basins, as well the Conejos Formation around the Monte Vista Basin area captured detritus from local volcanic activity (Cather, 2004, 2009; Lipman, Steven, & Mehnert, 1970). Late Eocene fluvial rocks of the basal Chuska Formation record basement, recycled sedimentary, and volcanic sourcing in the western portion of the San Juan Basin, suggesting similar deposition in the axis of the basin despite subsequent erosion (Cather, 2009).

5.8 | The ultimate sink: Laramide activity & Gulf of Mexico sedimentation

Upstream changes in sediment character and storage impact downstream depocenters, but may be diluted and obscured through downstream integration with other rivers. This is evident in the dramatic provenance change and the extended period of erosion in the El Rito depocenter compared to the more subdued provenance change and abbreviated depositional hiatus in the Galisteo depocenter (Figure 12). These local source-to-sink systems are microcosms of the larger drainage systems linking the Laramide province and the Gulf of Mexico.

Paleogene fluvial systems draining northern New Mexico flowed to the Gulf of Mexico’s northwest coast (Blum et al., 2017; Galloway et al., 2011). Peak sedimentation in the Gulf of Mexico occurred in the late Paleocene (Galloway et al., 2011). Peak sediment accumulation rate in the Gulf of Mexico approximately coincides with erosion and sediment bypass in many Laramide basins, including the Galisteo depocenter where it is marked by the basal Diamond Tail Formation unconformity (Cather, 2004; Dickinson et al., 2017; Galloway et al., 2011). Conversely, some of the lowest Cenozoic sedimentation rates in the Gulf of Mexico occur in the middle Eocene and correspond to the timing of sediment capture in many
Laramide basins (e.g., Galisteo depocenter, Baca Basin, Sierra Blanca Basin, Carthage-la Joya Basin, Monte Vista Basin, Denver Basin, North Park Basin, Echo Park Basin; Cather, 2009; Cather et al., 2004; Chapin & Cather, 1983; Dickinson et al., 1988; Lawton, 2008; Soister & Tschudy, 1978).

Discrimination of sediment inputs from different Laramide source regions is complicated by abundant non-unique sources and coeval tectonic activity across the region. Further, even in sediment sourcing scenarios that involve unique detrital zircon age populations, recycling and downstream mixing may obfuscate provenance. Nevertheless, mixture model results from the Gulf of Mexico highlight detrital zircon ages that were missing (at least in the correct proportions) from our north-central New Mexico source profiles. Detrital zircon age populations of <200 Ma and >2.0 Ga from Gulf of Mexico samples are not characterized well by our source profiles. The former is the most significant contributor to the poor mixture model fits presented herein. We interpret the <200 Ma group to indicate sourcing from volcanic arc activity, which was focused along the western margin of North America, but was also distributed across much of the western interior during flat slab subduction and rollback (Coney & Reynolds, 1977; Copeland et al., 2017). Early Paleoproterozoic and Archean ages observed in the Gulf of Mexico dataset are most likely sourced from the northern Laramide province (i.e., WY and MT) where basement-cored structures exhumed rocks that range from 1.9 to 3.5 Ga (Chamberlain et al., 2003 and the references therein).

When comparing approximately coeval Gulf of Mexico and north-central New Mexico detrital zircon age distributions (Figure 10), it is important to interpret relative source increases and decreases within the context of mixture model comparison metrics. The good to very good fit of mixture models and similarity in non-magmatic arc source relative proportions between the Midway–middle Wilcox groups and the Diamond Tail Formation are consistent with similar sediment sourcing from north-central New Mexico in both source profiles 1 and 1SJ (Table 6). We interpret the comparatively higher proportion of magmatic arc source and lower proportion of San Jose Formation source in the Gulf of Mexico samples to reflect downstream dilution by other in-route sediment source areas. The relatively poor model fit of the upper Wilcox Group sample indicates either poorly characterized source, which would indicate a change in the catchment during upper Wilcox deposition in the Colorado-Brazos catchment, or a poorly characterized basin sample due to the small sample size (n = 98).

Modelling the lower Claiborne Group with the Appalachian provenance group as a potential source (i.e., source group 1_App) significantly increases the goodness of fit compared to models that exclude the Appalachian provenance group (e.g., source group 1) (Table 6). Possible explanations for the significant change in detrital zircon age distribution during lower Claiborne Group deposition include two endmember scenarios: (a) recycling of Appalachian/Ouachita basin material (i.e., eastern source) or (b) recycling Mesozoic strata from the Laramide province (i.e., western source) (see Wahl, Yancey, Pope, Miller, & Ayers, 2016 for further discussion). We prefer the eastern-source interpretation from the Appalachian region for the following reasons: (a) the very good model fit of source profiles that included the Appalachian source group (V statistic = 0.08; source profiles 1_App and 1_App+SJ) versus the poor fit of source profiles without (V statistic = 0.17; source profiles 1 and 1_SJ) (Table 6), (b) the high proportion of Appalachian source (~65%; Figure 11k, Appendix 5) attributed to the Claiborne Group in models with a very good V statistic, (c) the observed decrease in an otherwise upward increasing trend in Mesozoic and Cenozoic zircons during Claiborne deposition (Figure 11k), (d) the change in the lower Claiborne Group's Proterozoic age proportions compared to the rest of the Paleocene–early Oligocene detrital zircon spectra (Figure 11j–o) despite waning basement-involved shortening during Claiborne deposition (i.e., middle Eocene) (Dickinson et al., 1988), and (e) the change in heavy mineral assemblage during this stratigraphic interval documented by other researchers (Craddock & Kylander-Clark, 2013; McCarley, 1981; Todd & Folk, 1957). We propose 3 possible eastern sources of Appalachian sediments to the lower Claiborne Group: (a) direct sourcing by Appalachian or Ouachita fluvial systems, (b) recycling of Appalachian-derived sediments from the Sabine Uplift during mid-Eocene exhumation (Ewing, 2009), or (c) local recycling of Appalachian-derived sediments from the Gulf coast. Regardless of the specific mechanism, the most salient control of lower Claiborne Group sediment composition is a decrease in Laramide province-sourced sediment in the middle Eocene (Galloway et al., 2011).

The westward incursion of Appalachian-derived source material along the Gulf of Mexico margin during Claiborne deposition, in part resulted from in-route storage of sediment by Laramide basins within the catchment of transcontinental drainage systems. The relative increase in Appalachian source contributions during the middle Eocene correlates with low sediment supply to the northwestern margin of the Gulf of Mexico (Eargle, 1968; Galloway, 2002; Galloway et al., 2011), and sediment capture by late stage Laramide basins such as the Galisteo depocenter. This overall decrease in sedimentation rate from Paleocene through Eocene (Galloway et al., 2011) occurs despite ongoing tectonism in the Laramide province and is a result of sequestration of sediment by Laramide basins. Waning tectonic activity during the middle to late Eocene decreased sediment production while pre-existing Laramide basins continued to sequester sediment, which further decreased external drainage. A dearth of Laramide-sourced detritus in the middle Eocene drove
that during infilling of paleo-relief and broadening of the detrital zircon data, and stratigraphic architecture indicate portion of these paleo-valleys. Paleocurrent measurements, the lower El Rito Formation was deposited in the narrowest tem with eastward flowing tributaries on its western flank. The lower El Rito fluvial system, which was bounded to east and west by the BSC and NGA uplifts, respectively. The lower El Rito Rito and Galisteo formations to be the same surface, their respective depocenters buried this unconformity at different times and are interpreted to have experienced fundamentally different accommodation mechanisms. While accommodation in the Galisteo depocenter was clearly driven by tectonic subsidence, the preservation of the El Rito Formation is attributed to incision and subsequent infilling of the erosional envelope created by exhumation of the NGA Uplift-driven river incision. This early Eocene exhumation was the primary driver local drainage reorganization and was generally coincident with regional drainage reorganization documented by Galloway et al. (2011) and Blum et al. (2017).

The western and eastern El Rito study areas are located at the junction between trunk and tributary streams in the El Rito fluvial system, which was bounded to east and west by the BSC and NGA uplifts, respectively. The lower El Rito Formation records a southward flowing trunk fluvial system with eastward flowing tributaries on its western flank. The lower El Rito Formation was deposited in the narrowest portion of these paleo-valleys. Paleocurrent measurements, detrital zircon data, and stratigraphic architecture indicate that during infilling of paleo-relief and broadening of the floodplain, the El Rito Formation transitioned from a gravelly braided system to sandy meandering system as local basement-involved tectonic activity waned, fluvial gradients flattened, and western-sourced feeder streams from the NGA Uplift receded.

Basal El Rito conglomerates and associated sandstones highlight discrepancies in provenance proxies and suggest recycling of BSC Uplift derived quartzite by the exhumation of the NGA Uplift. Conglomerates in the El Rito study area are consistently dominated by quartzite cobbles and boulders, yet associated detrital zircon age distributions, in agreement with paleocurrent data, reveal unique signatures from both the BSC and NGA uplifts, and suggest NGA Uplift sourcing. We interpret this disagreement to result from the difference in mechanical durability between the quartzite- and Mesozoic sandstone-derived gravels. Mobilization of recycled quartzite gravel alongside clasts of Mesozoic sandstone resulted in disaggregation of the weaker lithology and provenance biasing by grain size.

Early Eocene tectonic activity and associated drainage re-organization in north-central New Mexico exerted influence over sedimentation along the northwest margin of the Gulf of Mexico by restricting sediment to the paleo Colorado-Brazos River system. This was due at least in part to sediment sequestration during Eocene (e.g., Galisteo, El Rito, Espinaso, and Baca formations) deposition. Changes in drainage configuration and accommodation in these north-central New Mexico depocenters affected the distal reaches of Gulf of Mexico-bound fluvial systems through sediment production and capture, but were diluted and obscured through in-route sediment storage and downstream integration with other rivers. The middle Eocene decrease in sedimentation rates is coeval with a relative decrease in Laramide province-derived sediment and increase in Appalachian-derived sediment in the northwestern Gulf of Mexico margin. This suggests that sediment storage in Laramide basins played a first-order control on both the volume and character of the sediment delivered to the Gulf coast. This, in turn, impacted marine transgressions, stratal stacking patterns, and ultimately hydrocarbon prospectivity of Paleogene Gulf of Mexico reservoirs.
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