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INTRODUCTION

This report contains the papers presented at a geothermal energy exploration and resource assessment technical conference which was held in Glenwood Springs, Colorado, on May 4 - 6, 1981. This State Coupled Team conference was sponsored by the U. S. Department of Energy, Division of Geothermal Energy (DOE/DGE) and was conducted by the Earth Science Laboratory Division of the University of Utah Research Institute in cooperation with the Colorado Geological Survey. The conference was attended by 55 participants representing 19 states, DOE/DGE, U. S. Geological Survey (USGS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL), Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) and various associated consulting organizations. A total of 25 technical papers were presented which touched upon virtually every aspect of geothermal resource exploration and assessment technology, as developed and applied in a wide variety of geological terrane and structural conditions.

The DOE State Coupled Geothermal Resource Assessment Program began in 1977 under the Energy Resource Development Act, at a time when the development of new energy sources, as alternates to imported fossil fuels, became an important national goal. In the United States, some limited exploitation of sub-surface hydrothermal energy had begun, utilizing steam or hot water from a few areas where obvious surface manifestations of geothermal activity had long been known. The Geysers, in Sonoma County, California, under development by Pacific Gas and Electric, was the only commercial geothermal power plant in the U. S. This complex now has a generating capacity of nearly 910 megawatts and represents 8% of PG&E's total capacity.
INTRODUCTION (Continued)

The first systematic effort to estimate the geothermal resources of the entire U. S. was undertaken by the USGS with some support from DOE and published in 1975 (U. S. Geological Survey Circular 726, White and Williams, Eds.). This work was continued and an updated assessment was published in 1978 (U. S. Geological Survey Circular 790, L. J. P. Muffler, Ed.). It was soon realized that a truly useful inventory of the Nation's usable geothermal energy would require a considerable multidisciplinary effort. Exploration methods long used for oil, gas and mineral exploration were found lacking and refined exploration techniques were now necessary for the cost effective location and technical description of geothermal systems.

The DOE State Coupled Program, in cooperation with the USGS, NOAA, various state geological and water resource departments, universities and private research organizations, is helping to provide the necessary talent for the development of geothermal exploration techniques, and the location, description and reporting of potential geothermal energy resources. The papers presented at this conference, and the accompanying Volume of Bibliographies of papers describing other work accomplished by the state teams, are a result of this program. These papers reflect the excellent progress that has been made in all areas to aid significantly in the identification and commercial development of an increasingly important National resource.

Carl A. Ruscetta
Duncan Foley
ASPECTS OF LOW TEMPERATURE GEOTHERMAL RESOURCE ASSESSMENT
WITH EXAMPLES FROM KANSAS AND OREGON

David D. Blackwell
Department of Geological Sciences
Southern Methodist University,
Dallas, Texas 75275

ABSTRACT

The geological factors which need to be taken into account in the assessment of low temperature geothermal resources are those which control subsurface temperature and fluid flow. The primary quantities of interest are surface temperature, heat flow (thermal conductivity and geothermal gradient), geology, and hydrology. Factors causing variation in heat flow (geothermal gradient) are discussed. Local heat flow is effected by mantle heat flow, the heat production of the crust, local anomalous heat sources, local vertical and lateral variations in thermal conductivity and in some cases by water flow. Because of the many, complex, and geographically variable factors which are involved in determining temperature at a specific point, a uniform country-wide approach to low temperature geothermal assessment is not possible. The deficiencies of existing analyses of only "geothermal gradient" as a basic approach and as illustrated by three different gradient maps are demonstrated. Examples of approaches to evaluation in two different settings (Kansas and Oregon) are illustrated. Kansas is in the geologically stable Midcontinent where horizontal sedimentary rocks overlie a granitic and metamorphic basement. Oregon is in the geologically complex and young Cordillera. The significant data in Kansas include relatively widely spaced (10-20 km), vertically detailed, temperature-depth and thermal conductivity measurements and aquifer analyses (location, water quality and flow characteristics). It is possible to interpolate temperature values at intermediate sites using well samples and logs to determine basement radioactivity and thermal conductivity and thus local heat flow and temperature. In Oregon, in the more complex geological provinces, assessment must proceed statistically or on a case by case basis. The important parameters are local geothermal gradients and heat flow, and aquifer conditions. Interpolated values between data points are not reliable because an individual data point has a lateral zone of significance of only about 1-5 km.
INTRODUCTION

The utilization of low temperature geothermal resources (below 150°C and especially below 100°C) is quite different than the utilization of higher temperature geothermal resources. Similarly the exploration techniques are quite different so a customized exploration approach is necessary in low temperature resource assessment. Description of such a customized approach is the object of this paper.

In exploring for high temperature geothermal systems for power generation the main objective is to locate anomalous areas which can then be evaluated. On the other hand, utilization of low temperature resources is possible in many areas of "normal" temperatures. Similarly, there is a major difference in the transportability of the energy. It is as economically effective to transport electrical power produced from geothermal energy for long distances. However, it is not economical to transmit low temperature geothermal fluids over the same long distances. In Iceland, pipelines carry geothermal waters over 20 kilometers to heat most of the town of Reykjavik. However, pipeline costs probably prohibit such transportation distances for any but the largest of geothermal space heating systems. Northwest Geothermal Corporation in Portland, Oregon has studied the concept of transporting low temperature resources a distance of perhaps 50 kilometers from the vicinity of Mt. Hood to the outskirts of Portland, Oregon (John Hook, personal communication, 1978). However, only feasibility studies have been initiated. Therefore, in general, utilization of low temperature geothermal resources depends on knowledge of the local geothermal conditions.

Finally, the economics of low temperature geothermal development do not allow for extensive exploration. The drilling of a single production well may be the only exploration costs that can be justified. Therefore the main objective of a
low temperature resource assessment program should be to identify and to evaluate low temperature geothermal resources near likely areas of utilization so the user can then take the information, drill his production well, and install the surface equipment necessary. Because of the nature of the resource, only the most cost effective exploration techniques can be utilized. These techniques will consist generally of geological studies, geochemical studies, scrounge (freehole) temperature gradient and heat flow studies, and hydrology studies. Heat flow and geothermal gradient drilling would be the most expensive techniques justified in the general case. The difficulty with other geophysical techniques is that they cannot directly identify the actual temperatures present and drilling will be required in any case to evaluate the resource. Techniques such as resistivity profiling, gravity studies, and seismic studies may be important for specific sites.

The emphasis in this paper is on geothermal gradient and heat flow studies but the interrelation of these techniques with other techniques will also be discussed. In the application of heat flow and geothermal gradient techniques to the assessment of low temperature geothermal systems there are two strategies; the first strategy is to make temperature measurements in existing wells in order to directly measure the main parameter of interest, temperature, at various depths; the second strategy is to drill holes specifically for heat flow-geothermal gradient studies in areas which appear geologically and hydrologically favorable and where holes do not otherwise exist or are too shallow. One advantage of the heat flow-geothermal gradient studies is that they are non specific, i.e. they furnish information for evaluation of the area both for high temperature and dry hot rock resources as well as low temperature resources. Therefore, the data collected for the purpose of evaluation of any of the three resources can apply just as well to the other two.

The approach in this paper is to describe the different types of evaluation
techniques which can be applied in two completely different geological settings; one, the state of Kansas in the stable interior part of the North American continent; two, the state of Oregon in the geologically young Cordillera of the western United States. In Kansas, Pre-Cambrian igneous and metamorphic basement rocks are overlain by near horizontal Paleozoic, Mesozoic and Cenozoic sedimentary rocks. The main geothermal resource is warm water in porous sedimentary layers above the basement. Lateral and vertical variations in the temperature in the aquifers will be small and a relatively wide spacing of holes will suffice for the geothermal evaluation. On the other hand, in Oregon, the geological setting is complex and there is a wide variety of heat flow settings as well. A much denser measurement spacing is necessary to evaluate such a complicated area where there are many different controls on the heat flow. As a preface to the discussions of these two areas, the various general controls on subsurface temperature will be discussed and previous attempts to evaluate the low temperature geothermal potential on a country-wide basis will be briefly discussed.

CONTROLS ON SUBSURFACE TEMPERATURES

The factors which control subsurface temperature include regional heat flow, geology, hydrology and surface temperature. The regional heat flow is the heat which comes from the mantle. Its ultimate origin is uncertain but it probably comes from either the internal heat of the earth left over from planetary formation deeply buried radioactivity, or viscous friction as the plates slip over the interior of the earth. In the absence of disturbing factors such as hydrologic circulation, lateral variation in thermal properties and so forth, the surface heat flow is a function of this regional heat flow and the heat production of the basement rocks, i.e. the amount of heat generated from the decay of uranium, thorium, and potassium in the outermost 10-20 km of the crust. Studies of the correlation between heat flow and heat generation in plutons demonstrate a very systematic
relationship (Birch et al., 1968; Roy et al., 1968; Lachenbruch, 1968). This correlation between heat flow and heat production can be used to infer properties of the crust and to identify the regional background heat flow for a given heat flow province (Roy et al., 1972).

In a horizontally layered sequence of sedimentary rock such as that overlying the basement of the Mid-continent region, the vertical heat flow above the basement will be constant. Since the heat flow is constant, the temperature gradient will be inversely proportional to the thermal conductivity. Therefore, the temperature at a given depth is a function of the mean thermal conductivity above that point, the surface temperature and the regional heat flow. So in order to evaluate the temperature in the aquifer at a given depth three things must be known: the surface temperature, the surface heat flow, and the total thermal resistance (inverse of the mean thermal conductivity) between the surface and the depth to the aquifer. The thermal resistance of the sedimentary section can be determined from direct measurements, from knowledge of lithology or from indirect measurements such as well logs, seismic data, etc. These various techniques will be discussed in a following section.

Lateral variations in heat flow within a given heat flow province not caused by variations in basement radioactivity are due to variations in the geology which result in lateral variations of thermal conductivity (thermal refraction) and in hydrologic effects on heat flow data. The effects of refraction on heat flow have been discussed in the literature (Lee and Henyey, 1974, and others). These refraction effects will be common in areas of complex geology. In general, basement variations of thermal conductivity will have a minor effect of the temperatures in the overlying sedimentary rocks.

The final major control on heat flow and subsurface temperature is the hydrologic setting. Although a large amount of data have been collected in the past
few years so that we can quantify the effects of hydrology on heat flow, there is still a great amount of confusion in the literature about the exact nature of these effects. Enough data has been collected to know when hydrology is likely to effect heat flow values and when it is not. The areas where heat flow values are effected by hydrology are more easily recognizable than the impression generally given in literature. In areas of high heat flow and extensive fracturing, geothermal systems obviously represent severe hydrologic distortions of the regional conductive heat flow pattern. Such a geothermal system close to a heavily populated area represents a very cost effective energy source. In some situations the circulation is so fast that the heat flow is essentially washed away. These effects are confined, however, to extremely porous and permeable shallow rocks, such as very young volcanic rocks, typical of the Snake Plain aquifer of eastern Idaho (Brott et al., 1981), the Bend area in central Oregon (Blackwell and Steele, 1979) and in very porous gravels and alluvial deposits. Aquifer locations and characteristics in the United States have been extensively studied and even in most major aquifers, flow of water is slow enough that the conductive heat flow is preserved. In the basalt aquifers of the Columbia Plateau regional heat flow is only slightly distorted by the water circulation, although large head differences exist in aquifers cut by a single well. Intrabore communication may cause extremely complicated temperature-depth curves but if the holes are grouted the observed temperature-depth curves are linear and indicate that the primary effect on subsurface temperature is conductive heat flow and not fluid motion.

In the Midcontinent aquifer flow may cause small variations in heat flow and temperature, but these will be recongizable on a regional scale and will not effect small areas (see Gosnold, 1981). An exception to this comment may be found along the Missouri River in South Dakota and Nebraska where the hot water occurs in shallow wells in the Dakota Sandstone. Adolphson and LeRoux (1968) suggested
that the water is leaking up from a deeper aquifer (Madison Limestone) into the Dakota Sandstone. This is the only known such geothermal gradient and heat flow anomaly in the eastern United States, although others may well exist. Therefore in the eastern United States the effects of hydrology on heat flow in general are relatively minor except in a few isolated cases.

EXISTING HEAT FLOW AND GEOTHERMAL GRADIENT MAPS

There are two extensive evaluations of the geothermal potential of the United States published by the U.S. Geological Survey (White and Williams, 1975; Muffler, 1979). The emphasis in these reports is on evaluation of high temperature hydrothermal (>90°C) convective systems. Thus these studies have not attempted to evaluate "background" areas where much, if not most utilizable, low temperature potential exists.

Various heat flow maps have been published for the United States (Sass et al., 1971; Roy et al., 1972; Sass et al., 1981). Heat flow maps by the nature of their preparation take into account the thermal conductivity of rocks so that they show less scatter due to geologic variations than would a geothermal gradient map. However, for the low temperature geothermal utilization the important quality is the local mean geothermal gradient and the temperature in aquifers where the hot fluid can be brought to the surface relatively easily. These data are not readily apparent from heat flow maps.

Partially in an intent to go back more closely to temperature several different geothermal gradient maps of the United States have been prepared. However, geothermal gradient maps will be more susceptible to variations in approach and ways of treating the data than will the heat flow maps and this variation shows up in the gradient maps. Three rather extensive data bases have been utilized to prepare maps. A map was prepared and published by A.A.P.G.-U.S.G.S. (1976)
based on bottom hole temperatures measured during drilling of hydrocarbon exploration wells. Kron and Heiken (1980) published a geothermal gradient map based on the extensive heat flow data base available in the literature and in preprint form. Guffanti and Nathenson (1980) published a map based on a data set obtained during the 1920's and 30's of gradients from hydrocarbon exploration wells, generally deeper than 500m, obtained from logging with maximum reading thermometers (Van Ostrand, 1951). The maps prepared using these three different data sets show very little similarity of geothermal gradient contours and if the contours were plotted without the map base, it would not be apparent that the same areas are in fact involved in the studies. Part of the reason for the difference is that three totally different data sets have been evaluated and presented independently. These data are interrelated but do not a priori have the same information content. Thus, there is a great variance in the contours for the same areas between the different maps and the fact is that none of the three maps is of much use in the general evaluation of geothermal potential. This point will be illustrated in the discussion. A major reason for variations on the A.A.P.G.-U.S.G.S. map is that the map is based on the single-point bottom-hole temperature values and is afflicted with problems of temperature non-equilibrium and data uncertainty. Nevertheless, this map has been used extensively and its relationship to more detailed data has been discussed fairly completely (for example, see Gosnold, 1981). The contours from the Guffanti and Nathenson (1980) map and the Kron and Heiken map (1980) in Kansas are shown in Fig. 1 as is some deep well control which has become available since these maps were produced. The Guffanti and Nathenson (1980) map has an area of high gradient in the center part of the state with lower gradient to the east and to the west (based on one data point). The Kron and Heiken (1980) map has a localized area of high gradient near the extreme eastern edge of the state and very low gradient in the center part of the state. Not only are these...
maps very different, but it will be demonstrated in the next section that neither of these contourings is an accurate and useful depiction of the geothermal gradient in Kansas from the point of view of low temperature resource assessment.

In the state of Oregon, the Kron and Heiken (1980) map is based on an extensive set of heat flow data presented by Blackwell et al. (1978). Because the thermal conductivity of most of the surface rocks in Oregon does not vary greatly, the gradient map approximates the published heat flow map. The Guffanti and Nathenson (1980) map contours are based on four data points. Their map indicates that the area east of the Cascade Range has a gradient between 35 and 39°C/km whereas, in fact, except for the Blue Mountains and the Columbia Plateau regions, the whole area has a gradient in excess of 50°C/km (see below). The Guffanti and Nathenson (1980) map is of little use in the state of Oregon because of the small data base and because it has essentially ignored a very extensive set of data which was available at the time the map was prepared.

Thus the existing gradient maps do not approach adequacy for the evaluation of low temperature geothermal potential. In part this is because of lack of data, but in part it is because of an incomplete approach to the problem. Since the nature of the data which must be used in the evaluation varies from place to place based on geologic setting, a single systematic countrywide approach is not possible. The object of the remaining sections of this paper is to discuss in more detail the way low temperature geothermal evaluation might proceed and a possible types and sources of data which should be used in low temperature geothermal evaluation.

KANSAS

Until quite recently, there was only one area in Kansas for which relatively accurate and detailed temperature measurements were available. This was near the Lyons area in central Kansas (Sass et al., 1971). Recently, a series of wells
drilled as aquifer tests by the U.S. Geological Survey and the Kansas Geological Survey (Steeples and Bickford, 1981) allowed a much more detailed set of measurements in several holes. In addition, some abandoned or shut-in hydrocarbon wells were logged. The locations of these wells are shown in Fig. 1. Details of the drilling and the studies which have been carried out in the wells are given by Steeples and Bickford (1981). In this discussion the holes are identified by their township /range and section location and the township identifications are given in Fig. 1. The basic section encountered in the hole consists of Permian sands, shales and evaporite deposits. Below the Permian is a Pennsylvanian section which is predominately limestone and shale with minor amounts of sandstone and coal. The Paleozoic section below the Pennsylvanian consists primarily of carbonate rocks (limestone and dolomite) with one or two units of shale (the Chattanooga shale and the Silvan shale). The geologic section in each hole varies greatly in thermal conductivity both between geologic systems and of course within the systems. As an example mean temperature gradients between 100 and 200 meters and between 400 and 500 meters for the various holes are shown in Fig. 1. These gradients can be compared to the gradient contours taken from the two maps previously discussed. The complications are clear. They are also clearly indicated by the data in the hole 315/20E-22cc (Fig. 2). This hole is a mean gradient of $53^\circ\text{C}/\text{km}$ between 100 and 200 meters while mean gradient between 400 and 500 meters is $14^\circ\text{C}/\text{km}$, the main difference being the variation in conductivity between the shale rich Pennsylvanian section and dolomite rich lower Paleozoic section. The thermal conductivity contrast for these two sections of rock is 4-5 with the similar resulting ratio of geothermal gradients.

Thus it is clear that a useful evaluation of low temperature geothermal potential of Kansas is not possible without taking into account the local geologic section (thermal conductivity) and the depths to aquifers (in the case of Kansas...
these are primarily the lower Paleozoic carbonate rocks). Since detailed temperature and thermal conductivity measurements are not available for many holes, the mean thermal conductivity (or thermal resistivity) of the sedimentary section must be obtained by some other technique. Fig. 3 shows a comparison of geothermal gradient, gamma ray and P-wave velocity logs for hole 13S/2W-32cc. The gamma ray and P-wave data are based on commercially run well logs, digitized at 0.5 intervals and averaged over 3.5 m. The correlation of the gradient with other geophysical logs and lithology is obvious. Based on the data from Kansas, a linear correlation between geothermal gradient, and gamma ray activity and travel time has been established for a predominately carbonate-shale section (Blackwell and Steele, 1981). Thus, within the state of Kansas the mean thermal conductivity of the sedimentary section can be established from well log parameters so that, given the heat flow from the basement, the temperatures at depth in the sedimentary section can be predicted at points between the control wells.

A result of this study was the discovery that shale thermal conductivity values have been overestimated by as much as 50% in literature and that the Paleozoic shale conductivities are as low as 1.0-1.2 W m$^{-1}$ K$^{-1}$. Thus thick shale sections in the Midcontinent are as thermally "insulating" as the basins in the Basin-Range province or as the Tertiary and Cretaceous section along the East Coast and so the concept of hot spots associated with radiogenic plutons (see Costain, 1977) certainly applies to the Midcontinent as well as to the East Coast. The recent discovery of a radiogenic basement pluton in Illinois with a heat generation of approximately 16μW m$^{-3}$ (Rahman and Roy, 1981) suggests that very high temperatures may occur locally in the Midcontinent and that drilling based on certain types of basement geophysical anomalies might find much higher temperatures than has previously been expected.

Another parameter which must be obtained for low temperature evaluation by
interpolation between control wells is the background heat flow. In the Mid-
continent this heat flow will be related to basement radioactivity because in
Kansas the basement heat flow seems to be related to the Q-A relationship dis-
cussed by Birch et al. (1968) and Roy et al. (1968). Thus if the radioactivity
of the basement rocks is known, the heat flow can be predicted at any locality.
Initial studies have begun but much remains to be done.

A final factor which could significantly affect the temperatures would be
lateral motion in the aquifers. The objective of drilling the test wells was to
evaluate flow in these aquifers. Detailed temperature measurements and compari-
sions of ratios of gradients in various lithologies, both above and below the
carbonate aquifers, clearly indicates that lateral aquifer flow does not affect
temperature measurements (heat flow) in Kansas. The precision with which this
conclusion can be established is approximately ±5% so that water flow effects
below this value would not be detected.

OREGON

The geologic setting in Oregon is much more complicated than that in Kansas.
From the geothermal point of view the state can be divided into approximately four
different regions: the northeast, the southeast, the High Cascade Range, and the
provinces west of the High Cascade Range. The assessment of the geothermal poten-
tial of each of these areas must be addressed on an individual basis. Extensive
measurements are available for the state of Oregon (Blackwell et al., 1978;
Blackwell and Steele, 1979, unpublished data). A heat flow map for the state is
shown in Fig. 4 based on over 200 data points. The division of the state into the
four previously mentioned areas is illustrated. Histograms of geothermal gradient
are shown in Fig. 5 (Blackwell et al., 1978). In the case of Oregon the distri-
bution of gradient values is approximately the same as the distribution of heat
flow because of the relatively small variation in thermal conductivity in the basi
volcanic, intrusive and volcanoclastic rocks which make up most of the surface exposure.

The assessment of the coastal provinces is relatively straightforward. Because the gradient and heat flow variations are quite small and because the rocks in general are relatively impermeable so that there do not appear to be many hydrothermal convective systems, the primary resource is merely water from aquifers. The potential of such aquifers can be assessed, given their location and depth, with available data.

The Cascade Range is generally a high temperature province because of its relatively inaccessible nature (distance from low temperature market) with the exception perhaps of the Mt. Hood region, and its assessment represents problems which cannot be addressed in the space available.

The northeastern corner of the state in general has a relatively small scatter in gradient. However there are a significant number of hot springs (Bowen et al., 1978) and so there is some potential for local hydrothermal systems as well as for deep hot water in aquifers. It is clear that the scatter of gradients is somewhat larger than that observed in the coastal provinces.

By far the most complicated region geothermally is the southeastern part of the state. The histogram shown in Fig. 5 illustrates the extreme scatter in the gradient values, ranging from 0 to over 200°C/km as opposed to the coastal provinces where the range is only from 20 to 50°C/km maximum. There are many geothermal systems and many local and regional aquifers in southeastern Oregon. The complicated nature of the heat flow contours (Fig. 4) is related to the local variations caused by the many different factors discussed above. In contrast to Kansas most of the heat flow and gradient variations are related to regional hydrologic circulation, lateral variations in heat flow related to perhaps intrusive centers, or some other source of crustal heat, rather than lateral variations in basement radioactivity.
and thermal conductivity of the geological section. In this area, the contribution of the crustal radioactivity contrasts to heat flow is essentially negligible. Hence evaluation of the hydrology, the structure and the water geochemistry are much more significant than is the study of basement rock radioactivity.

Because of the complex geology, young volcanism, and high relief, deterministic heat flow measurements were not possible and the average lateral significance of individual measurements is no more than 1 or 2 km (as opposed to 10-20 km in Kansas). In a setting such as this, low temperature geothermal assessment must be either on a specific area basis or on a statistical basis. We have approached the assessment in this area by obtaining as many heat flow and geothermal gradient measurements as possible in existing wells and holes drilled specifically for geothermal evaluation. The assessment is not as grim as it might appear, however, because near most of the populated areas, where low temperature geothermal resources utilization is most likely, there is generally a significant amount of drilling. Therefore it is possible to make scrounge heat flow, gradient, and temperature measurements directly in the areas of interest and thus one does not have to resort to statistics in evaluating many areas of high population density.
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Figure 1. Geothermal gradients in Kansas. Geothermal-gradient-to-2-km contours (Guffanti and Nathenson, 1980) shown with solid lines. Geothermal gradient contours shown with dashed lines from Kron and Heiken (1980). Hole locations shown are from Blackwell and Steele (1981). Hole identification is Township number. Gradients between 100-200 and 400-500 meters shown at right and below location dot respectively.

Figure 2. Temperature-depth and gradient data for Kansas hole 31S/20E-22 cac (Blackwell and Steele, 1981).

Figure 3. Bar graphs of gradient, P-wave velocity, and natural gamma ray activity and a generalized geologic section for Kansas hole 13S/2W-32 ccc.

Figure 4. Heat flow and physiographic province map of Oregon. Heat flow contours are shown in 20mWm$^{-2}$ intervals (0.5 μcal/cm$^2$ sec). Data from Blackwell et al (1978).

Figure 5. Histograms of geothermal gradient for various combinations of physiographic provinces in Oregon (Blackwell et al, 1978). N is the total number of samples.
Figure 1. Geothermal gradients in Kansas. Geothermal-gradient-to-2-km contours (Guffanti and Nathenson, 1980) shown with solid lines. Geothermal gradient contours shown with dashed lines from Kron and Heiken (1980). Hole locations shown are from Blackwell and Steele (1981). Hole identification is Township number. Gradients between 100-200 and 400-500 meters shown at right and below location dot respectively.
Figure 2. Temperature-depth and gradient data for Kansas hole 31S/20E-22 cac (Blackwell and Steele, 1981).
Figure 3. Bar graphs of gradient, P-wave velocity, and natural gamma ray activity and a generalized geologic section for Kansas hole 13S/2W-32 ccc.
Figure 4. Heat flow and physiographic province map of Oregon. Heat flow contours are shown in 20 mWm\(^{-2}\) intervals (0.5 \(\mu\)cal/cm\(^2\) sec). Data from Blackwell et al (1978).
Figure 5. Histograms of geothermal gradient for various combinations of physiographic provinces in Oregon (Blackwell et al, 1978). N is the total number of samples.
RESISTIVITY METHODS IN EXPLORATION FOR HYDROTHERMAL RESOURCES
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Introduction

This paper discusses the practical aspects of using d.c. resistivity in the exploration for hydrothermal resources. There are several reasons why low electrical resistivity is expected in hydrothermal aquifers but the association is not without pitfalls. Besides outlining the reasons why resistivity has proven a successful geothermal exploration tool, a section on how resistivity is practiced is included. Here, the common electrode arrays are considered with their major advantages and disadvantages pointed out. The current status in resistivity interpretation schemes is touched upon with emphasis on computer modeling. Finally, a successful resistivity case history of a low-temperature resource at Las Alturas Estates, New Mexico is included to illustrate a specific resistivity exploration philosophy. The case history concludes with drilling results which are, of course, the ultimate test.

Hydrothermal Resistivity Model

From the outset we should understand that the actual complex hydrogeological situation undergoes a simplifying transformation in the face of resolution and modeling capabilities in resistivity. Figure 1 illustrates a hydrothermal target which is a thermal aquifer perhaps first detected by a warm well. The plumbing system may be some complicated migration of thermal waters up various fault zones. We visualize this situation as a resistivity model with a conductive slab approximating the aquifer which is surrounded by electrically resistive blocks. Rarely can the plumbing system be seen with resistivity and usually surface topography is not considered. Dipping fault contacts are usually modeled as stepped resistivity boundaries (Figure 1).

![Figure 1. Comparison of complex hydrogeothermal target and simplified resistivity model.](image-url)
Use of Resistivity in Hydrothermal Exploration

The two major uses of resistivity measurements in hydrothermal exploration are outlined in Figure 2 as: 1) detection and delineation of aquifers and 2) estimation of aquifer temperature and water content.

USE OF RESISTIVITY IN HYDROTHERMAL EXPLORATION

DETECTION AND DELINEATION OF AQUIFERS

HYDROTHERMAL AQUIFERS HAVE LOW RESISTIVITY BECAUSE:

1. Water Decreases Resistivity
2. Increased temperature Decreases Resistivity of Water (Increased Ion Mobility)
3. Increased Water Temperature Increases Salinity by Dissolving More Minerals Which Decreases Resistivity (Increased Number of Charge Carriers)
4. Hydrothermal Alternation Minerals Decrease Resistivity (e.g. Igneous Rocks into Clay and Zeolites)

WARNING: Nonthermal Clay Zones May Have Resistivities Indistinguishable from Hydrothermal Aquifers.

ESTIMATION OF AQUIFER TEMPERATURE AND WATER CONTENT

LOWER RESISTIVITY IMPLIES HIGHER TEMPERATURE

POROSITY ESTIMATION BY ARCHIE'S LAW

\[ \frac{\rho_r}{\rho_w} \approx \Phi^{-2} \]

\( \rho_r \): Resistivity of Saturated Rock
\( \rho_w \): Resistivity of Saturing Water
\( \Phi \): Fractional Porosity

WARNING: Archie's "law" Is Empirically True for Clay-Free Aquifers Only.

Figure 2

First, and foremost, is the detection and delineation of aquifers. Here, the key property is that hydrothermal aquifers have low resistivity. This is true because of the inherent effect of water itself coupled with the temperature-resistivity dependencies of ion mobility, salinity, and hydrothermal mineral alternation. Despite all of these factors favoring the association of low resistivity with hydrothermal resources we are cautioned (Figure 2) that nonthermal clay zones may have d.c. resistivities indistinguishable from hydrothermal aquifers. This warning cannot be overemphasized; it is the most serious limitation regarding the identification of a thermal aquifer with resistivity alone. Thermal confirmation such as a warm well, a hot spring, or a high thermal gradient is necessary to connect low resistivity with a thermal anomaly.
The second application of resistivity is in the estimation of aquifer temperature and water content. Simply stated, lower resistivity implies higher temperature; however, quantitative relationships between fluid resistivity and temperature often yield incorrect temperature estimates in practice. Again, the presence of clay in the hydrothermal aquifer will produce erroneous results. An estimate of the amount of water-filled porosity can be accomplished by using some form of Archie's law. The simplest form of the equation is given in Figure 2. Here, a surface measurement of the resistivity of the saturated aquifer (ρR) is coupled with the resistivity value of the saturating fluid (ρw), e.g., obtained from a spring or well, to compute the fractional porosity, φ. Clay is again the major problem in such a calculation since Archie's relationship is really not a "law" but is empirically true for clay-free aquifers only. The application of Archie's relationship in geothermal exploration using surface resistivity is discussed by Meidav (1970).

Resistivity Techniques and Common Arrays

Resistivity techniques can be described by three categories as listed in Figure 3. These are: 1) vertical sounding accomplished by expanding an array and effectively sensing to greater depths, 2) horizontal profiling using a constant array spacing moved laterally along the surface, and 3) a combination of sounding and profiling to produce either a section or a map. Various electrode arrays are used to accomplish these purposes; the Wenner, Schlumberger, equatorial, dipole-dipole, and bipole-dipole arrays are the most common. The resistivity case history included later in this paper presents examples of one-dimensional (vertical) sounding, two-dimensional sounding-profiling producing a resistivity pseudosection, and bipole-dipole mapping allowing a three-dimensional interpretation.

RESISTIVITY TECHNIQUES AND COMMON ARRAYS

1. VERTICAL SOUNDING (1-D)
   WENNER, SCHLUMBERGER, EQUATORIAL ARRAYS

2. HORIZONTAL PROFILING (LIMITED 2-D)
   WENNER, SCHLUMBERGER ARRAYS

3. COMBINED SOUNDING — PROFILING PSEUDOSECTION (2-D)
   WENNER, SCHLUMBERGER, DIPOLE-DIPOLE ARRAYS
   MAPPING (3-D)
   BIPOLE-DIPOLE (ROVING DIPOLE) ARRAY

Figure 3

The common arrays where the voltage and current electrodes are emplaced in a collinear fashion are the Wenner, Schlumberger, and dipole-dipole arrays (Figure 4). Probably the best-known array is the Wenner array which has four equally spaced contacts with the earth; current is usually passed through the
two outer electrodes (A and B) and the resulting voltage drop is measured by the inner electrode pair (M and N). The Schlumberger array uses the MN electrodes much closer together, less than one-fifth the outer (AB) spacing. The dipole-dipole array separates the current transmitting dipole (AB) from the voltage receiving dipole (MN) by integer multiples of the dipole spacing (a).

There are two common areal resistivity arrays shown in plan views in Figure 5. In the equatorial array the voltage measuring MN electrodes are maintained parallel to a fixed AB current source but are, additionally, moved along the perpendicular bisector (or equator) of AB. It is obvious that the equatorial array is identical to the Schlumberger array (Figure 4) in the limiting case when MN is between AB, providing MN ≤ AB/5. The dipole-dipole technique in Figure 5 employs a long, fixed AB current source called a bipole to distinguish it from the much shorter MN voltage measuring dipoles. Usually two voltage dipoles (Figure 5) are used to calculate the gradient of the potential at each location which is the total vector electric field. The dipole-dipole method is also called roving dipole since voltage measurements are made by roving about the fixed current source. Further discussion of the particulars of various resistivity arrays may be found in Keller and Frischknecht (1966) and Zohdy (1970).
It is very important to consider the advantages and disadvantages of the various resistivity arrays before any field data are collected. The expected resistivity target, the logistics of the survey area, and the equipment capabilities are all crucial factors. These are usually not adequately appreciated prior to hiring a contractor or embarking on one's own field survey. A good practical comparison of the Wenner, Schlumberger, and dipole-dipole arrays appears in Zohdy et al. (1974). An excellent presentation of the use of various resistivity arrays in geothermal exploration is included in the Geothermal Resources Council Technical Training Course on "Geophysical Exploration Methods for Geothermal Resources". A considerably abridged version of the training material has been published by the instructor (Meidav, 1974).

Figure 6 summarizes the major advantages and disadvantages of the three common collinear resistivity arrays. The major advantage of the Wenner array is the large voltage drop that one obtains with a given current input. This is important if the field equipment has a limited capability. The only other advantage is the simple apparent resistivity formula; however, this is hardly a consideration, especially when using a pocket calculator in the field. The major disadvantage of the Wenner array is that a constant "a" spacing (Figure 4) must be maintained when expanding the array during soundings. Consequently, all four electrodes must be moved for each expanded spacing. Besides the additional time considerations, the movement of all four electrodes to new locations results in a higher susceptibility to surficial resistivity irregularities. Since the current and voltage wires are adjacent to each other, one must consider the possibility of errors due to inductive coupling. This
may not be serious and is easily corrected for by physically separating the wires.

### ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF COMMON RESISTIVITY ARRAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WENNER ARRAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Large Voltage Drop for Given</td>
<td>1. Sounding Requires Moving All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Simple Apparent Resistivity</td>
<td>Four Electrodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula</td>
<td>2. More Susceptible to Surficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resistivity Irregularities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Coupling Between Wires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHLUMBERGER ARRAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sounding Usually Requires</td>
<td>1. Lower Voltage Drop for Given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving Only Outer Two Electrodes</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Less Susceptible to Surficial</td>
<td>2. Coupling Between Wires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistivity Irregularities</td>
<td>3. Inverse Schlumberger More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Slightly Greater Probing Depth</td>
<td>Susceptible to Telluric Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than Wenner for Given Outer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spacing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Inverse Schlumberger Allows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFER Operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Inverse Schlumberger Reduces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement of Heavy,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENSIVE CURRENT WIRE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIPOLE-DIPOLE ARRAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Very Sensitive to Lateral</td>
<td>1. Low Voltage Drop for Given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistivity Variations</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shorter Lines Required for</td>
<td>2. Very Susceptible to Surficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given Probing Depth</td>
<td>Resistivity Irregularities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reduced Coupling Between</td>
<td>3. Complicated Pseudosections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wires</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6**

The Schlumberger array has many advantages over the Wenner array (Figure 6) and should be used rather than the Wenner array provided the field equipment can cope with the disadvantages of a lower voltage drop. This means a more sensitive voltage measuring device and/or a higher current source. Since the Schlumberger array requires only that MN is maintained less than AB/5 (Figure 4), a sounding can be accomplished by moving only the outer electrodes. In practice, a point is reached where the MN spacing must be expanded for a measureable voltage but usually several AB spacings can be used with each MN spacing. This aspect of the Schlumberger array is a major advantage logistically with considerations to manpower and time; it also reduces the susceptibility to surficial irregularities since only two electrodes are changed, not four as with the Wenner array. The slightly greater probing depth for a given spacing with the Schlumberger array compared to the Wenner array is a minor advantage. However, the advantages of the inverse Schlumberger array (Figure 6) are very important and the array is used by most experienced resistivity practitioners.

The inverse Schlumberger array is obtained by the simple exchange of the current and voltage electrodes, i.e. current is passed through MN and voltage drop is measured between A and B. Identical values of apparent resistivity.
result from this interchange (even for an anisotropic earth) as a consequence of the theorem of reciprocity (Keller and Frischknecht, 1966). Reciprocity is always a good check in the field to help insure that valid results are being obtained. Additionally, there is a major safety and logistical advantage using the inverse array (Figure 6). For example, when spacings are large, say AB is several kilometers, the MN current spacing may only be a few hundred meters in the inverse case. Such MN electrodes (and current wires) would be in sight of the transmitter operator rather than out of view, over a kilometer away, in the case of the normal Schlumberger operation. Besides the safety considerations, since the current wire is often heavier and more expensive, the shorter MN current source can save money and setup time.

Along with the lower voltage drop using the Schlumberger array as discussed previously, the only significant disadvantage is the increased telluric noise at large AB spacings when employing the inverse array. The time varying voltages due to telluric or natural earth currents increase linearly with contact spacing, thus degrade the received signals.

The dipole-dipole method has been shown to be very sensitive to lateral resistivity variations (Beyer, 1977). This is an advantage when looking for such boundaries but it, unfortunately, also results in high susceptibility to surficial irregularities (Figure 6). The dipole-dipole method has the advantages of shorter lines for a given probing depth and the decrease of inductive coupling between wires. However, the physical separation of the current and voltage dipoles results in much smaller voltage drop for a given current. This requires a larger current generating source when doing dipole-dipole soundings. The pseudosection method of plotting dipole-dipole results produces very complicated plots which can only be effectively analyzed by computer modeling. Dipole-dipole pseudosection plotting and interpretation is discussed later in the Las Alturas Estates field study.

**Resistivity Interpretation**

Figure 7 summarizes the current status of the interpretation of resistivity vertical sounding, horizontal profiling, and combined sounding-profiling. None of the resistivity results obtained in practice are amenable to unambiguous interpretation although layered, sounding results are theoretically unique.

Resistivity sounding results have been classically analyzed by logarithmic curve matching using albums of theoretical master curves such as those presented by Orellana and Mooney (1966). These curves, in conjunction with auxiliary charts, require considerable time even in experienced hands. Consequently, the manual methods have been superseded in cases where many layers are evident by automatic computer routines. The layered inversion program published by Zohdy (1974) is readily available and widely used. Probably the most readily available two-dimensional resistivity modeling program is that of Dey and Morrison (1976) and Dey (1976). Dey and Morrison's finite difference routine is not automatic since it is a forward solution not an inversion. Thus, the desired two-dimensional model is obtained by trial-and-error matching. No three-dimension resistivity computer code is readily available; however, a catalog of theoretical dipole-dipole results has been published by Hohmann and Jiracek (1979).
RESISTIVITY INTERPRETATION

1. VERTICAL SOUNDING
   Theoretically Unique Solutions (Nonunique in Practice)
   Logarithmic Plotting of Sounding Data Facilitates Curve-Matching
   Using Master Curves
   Fast, Efficient 1-D Computer Programs
   Readily Available

2. HORIZONTAL PROFILING
   Nonunique Solutions
   2-D Computer Programs Available

3. COMBINED SOUNDING-PROFILING
   Nonunique Solutions
   PSEUDOSECTIONS
   2-D Computer Programs Available
   MAPPING
   3-D Computer Programs Not Readily Available

Figure 7

Las Alturas Estates Resistivity Case History

Introduction. The proximity of New Mexico State University to domestic wells producing warm water at Las Alturas Estates motivated the electrical resistivity evaluation of the area. The Las Alturas prospect has no surface geothermal manifestations; a well drilled in 1960 at T.23 S, R.2 E, Sec. 34.214 (Figure 8) discovered water of 45°C at 100 m depth.

Resistivity evaluation of the area will be discussed in a sequence progressing from one-dimensional sounding, to two-dimensional combined sounding-profiling, and finally three-dimensional mapping. Crossed inverse Schlumberger soundings were centered on the warmest well (Figure 8). Two dipole-dipole lines were measured in east-northeast directions across the area and over 110 roving dipole points were used to map approximately 40 km² surrounding the bipole transmitters shown in Figure 8.

Schlumberger soundings. Crossed Schlumberger soundings centered at the warmest well (Figure 8) are presented in Figure 9 with five layer interpretations using the inversion method developed by Zohdy (1974). Both soundings clearly detect a significant conductive zone beyond approximately 30 m AB/2 spacing. Close scrutiny of the field results reveals that beyond this spacing
the 78° sounding systematically yields apparent resistivity values less than the 348° sounding. This is considered to be a consequence of the paradox of anisotropy (Keller and Frishknecht, 1966) whereby the minimum apparent resistivity is measured perpendicular to the strike of the conductive body. Hence, the conductive zone extends more north-south than east-west. Interpreted results in Figure 9 have not been corrected for anisotropy; however, the interpreted conductive layers of 8 and 9 ohm-m are identified with the thermal aquifer. Considering all of the results (including well data and the dipole-dipole results to be described) the 78° sounding is considered more representative of the section. Thus, the shallow geothermal target is estimated to extend in depth from approximately 100 to 250 m and to be roughly 10 ohm-m resistivity.

![Figure 8. Las Alturas Estates base map (after Smith, 1977).](image)

Dipole-dipole sounding-profiling. To further define the conductive zone associated with the geothermal aquifer, two dipole-dipole profiles were surveyed across the Las Alturas prospect. The lines were oriented (Figure 8) to better define the east-west extent of the conductive target. Figure 10 illustrates the method of plotting dipole-dipole apparent resistivity results in so-called pseudosection form. The values are first plotted at depth points determined by the intersection of lines drawn at 45° angles from the centers of the current and voltage dipoles. The combined values are then contoured to give the final pseudosection. Figure 11 presents the observed pseudosection for the southernmost dipole-dipole line (Figure 8) together with two-dimensional numerical model calculations (Dey, 1976). The modeling results are in good agreement.
Figure 9. Crossed Schlumberger soundings at Las Alturas Estates and interpreted five-layer models (after Smith, 1977).
with the Schlumberger results (Figure 9). Furthermore, the independent two-dimensional modeling allows more quantitative conclusions to be drawn. For example, the geothermal zone (~10 ohm-m) clearly extends more to the east from the warm wells in Figure 8 than west; the southwestern extent of the layer is terminated laterally 600 m from the well at station 9 by a resistive (~50-100 ohm-m) barrier. The zone is bounded on the east (~ station 42) by a very prominent resistive block (~300 ohm-m), the depth to the top of the 10 ohm-m layer varies from about 40-100 m, and the bottom of the zone appears to be at about 300 m. The conductive geothermal reservoir is similarly evident on the northern dipole-dipole line. Using the results from both dipole-dipole lines we are now able to define the lateral boundaries of the conductive aquifer along the survey lines. These boundaries are shown in Figure 12 by heavy black marks. Such delineation is clearly not sufficient for complete reservoir assessment but it does provide valuable lateral bounds on the conductive aquifer. Such boundaries are important in the placement of bipole current sources for the most effective mapping (Hohmann and Jiracek, 1979).

**DIPOLE-DIPOLE PLOTTING METHOD**

Bipole-Dipole Mapping. The 2 km bipole transmitter shown in Figure 13 has been the most effective in mapping the boundaries of the shallow conductive aquifer at Las Alturas Estates. Figure 13 was prepared by contouring the total field apparent resistivity values which were plotted at the receiver locations marked in Figure 8. Regions of apparent resistivity less than 60 ohm-m are shaded by the dot pattern in Figure 13.

Conductive regions (<60 ohm-m) mark the area of the hot wells in Figure 13. This zone is sharply circumscribed by a resistive pattern (>60 ohm-m) on the east, north, and west sides of the survey area. Three-dimensional modeling was applied interactively to these results to determine to what extent the observed patterns reflect the true subsurface resistivity distribution, i.e., the areal extent of the shallow geothermal aquifer.
Figure 11. Dipole-dipole pseudosection at Las Alturas Estates-south and two-dimensional model calculations (from Jiracek and Gerety, 1978).
Figure 12. Lateral boundaries (heavy marks) of conductive hydrothermal aquifer along dipole-dipole survey lines at Las Alturas Estates.

Figure 13. Observed total field apparent resistivity map of Las Alturas Estates (from Hohmann and Jiracek, 1979).
Figure 14 shows a plan view of the three-dimensional model used to approximate the conductive geothermal reservoir. This model was defined from the combined Schlumberger and dipole-dipole modeling (Figures 9 and 11) and by a comparison of the observed dipole-dipole patterns with theoretical results presented by Hohmann and Jiracek (1979). The reservoir is approximated by a slab of 10 ohm-m material which is 100 m deep and 500 m thick. The body has an approximately north-south length of 6 km and east-west width of 2.5 km. The more complex resistive body of 300 ohm-m to the east of the conductive slab in Figure 14 models the resistive limestone of Tortugas Mountain and its buried extension to the south. The conductive and resistive slabs are immersed in a half-space of 75 ohm-m.

![Figure 14](image_url)

Figure 14. Simple three-dimensional resistivity model of Las Alturas Estates (from Hohmann and Jiracek, 1979).

A comparison of the theoretical results in Figure 15 with the field data of Figure 13 reveals a remarkable similarity. It is apparent that the actual body is wider than the 2.5 km body modeled and may extend farther to the south. However, the 60 ohm-m contour may be considered as very nearly outlining the body in Figure 13. It is emphasized that no attempt was made to model the regions near the bipole electrodes which reflect shallow resistivity variations. The main interest was in duplicating the major patterns of the field results using all available constraints, e.g., Schlumberger, dipole-dipole, and drilling results. Results of the dipole-dipole mapping allow us to outline the areal extent of the conductive aquifer as shown in Figure 16. This outline should be taken as approximate only; dipole-
dipole boundaries (included in Figure 16) are better constrained. The outline is dashed to the south and southeast since our field data do not permit complete definition of this sector.

Figure 15. Calculated total field apparent resistivity map of Las Alturas Estates (from Hohmann and Jiracek, 1979).

Figure 16. Outline (heavy solid and dashed lines) of conductive hydrothermal aquifer at Las Alturas Estates.
Interpretation and Drilling Results. The major resistivity contrast detected by the dipole-dipole results in Figure 11 occurs in the vicinity of station 42 where a highly resistive (300 ohm-m) block terminates the conductive aquifer. This is the same location where the western boundary of the high apparent resistivity lobe surrounding Tortugas Mountain forms a distinct, sharp, and linear gradient (Figure 13). These results and the combined modeling suggest a fault zone west of Tortugas Mountain with an extension to the south. This geologically unmapped fault zone may govern the occurrence of hot water at Las Alturas Estates as hypothesized in Figure 17. This section would be appropriate to a profile running approximately along the northernmost dipole-dipole line (Figure 8).

HYPOTHETICAL CROSS SECTION OF THE LAS ALTURAS GEOTHERMAL SYSTEM

Figure 17. (after Morgan et al., 1980).

A consequence of the hypothetical cross section in Figure 17 is the expectation of higher shallow temperatures on the eastern side of the survey area. This original suggestion (Jiracek and Gerety, 1978) has been proven correct as is evident by the two temperature gradient curves in Figure 18. Locations of the two gradient wells are shown in Figure 17. It is significant to add that test well DT1 is located over the region of lowest modeled dipole-dipole resistivity (5 ohm-m).

A production well near DT1 is currently being used to heat a new home for the New Mexico State University president and plans are being formalized for more extensive use on campus.
Figure 18. Temperature data from test wells DT1 and DT2 at Las Alturas Estates (from Morgan et al., 1979).
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The Hot Dry Rock (HDR) Geothermal Energy Development Program began about eight years ago at the Los Alamos National Laboratory. It was conceived as a means of extracting geothermal energy from high temperature reservoir rocks with very low natural permeability. The basic concept involves drilling to a depth where temperatures are economically attractive, generating a large heat exchange surface by hydraulic fracturing, and finally drilling into the fractured zone with a second hole to form a closed-loop circulating system. Cold water injected down one borehole is heated as it flows along the fracture or through the fracture zone and then is returned to the surface via the second borehole.

Three types of geologic studies form parts of the HDR program. The first of these is directly concerned with the development of the prototype system at Fenton Hill, New Mexico. It is primarily concerned with providing direct geologic support to the drilling, fracturing, and reservoir formation operation at Fenton Hill. Subjects such as rock permeability, composition, fracture spacing, and orientation are addressed. In addition, as funding is available, exploration and assessment techniques are being tested around the Fenton Hill site. It is hoped that eventually a detailed case history will be developed that will allow comparison of the various geothermal exploration techniques.

The second group of geologic investigations is directed towards the selection of a second site for the testing of the HDR method of geothermal energy extraction. The Fenton Hill site is representative of one type of high grade HDR site, i.e., a site associated with a young silicic volcanic
center. If the HDR concept is ever to be widely used it must be thoroughly evaluated in other geologic environments. A number of possible sites are currently being examined. These range from sites in the eastern U.S. best suited for direct utilization to sites in the western U.S. associated with both high regional heat flow and young volcanism.

The third group of geologic investigations are the regional evaluations of the HDR resource base. The ultimate objective of these studies is the assessment of the HDR resource base of the entire United States. It is the results of these studies that are the most relevant to the Low Temperature Program.

The first step in exploration for any type of geothermal resource is the identification of a heat source. This holds true for high and low temperature hydrothermal, geopressed, and HDR resources. Clearly, without the heat nothing else matters. Evaluation of permeability is relegated to the second phase of the assessment activity.

To assess the HDR resource base of the United States, the country has been divided into broad regions with similar geologic settings. One or two persons at Los Alamos are responsible for the evaluation of each of these regions. Exploration and assessment work in these areas is being done by Los Alamos staff and academic and industrial subcontractors.

Arizona, New Mexico, and the Trans-Pecos area of west Texas comprise one of these regions. To help perform an assessment of this region, we are preparing a series of eleven maps at a scale of 1:1,000,000. The first two of the maps in this series evaluate direct evidence for regional and local (igneous point sources) heat sources. In press is an update of the volcanic rock map of Luedke and Smith (1978). Our version incorporates data published since 1978. Because rocks older than 3 m.y. have probably lost their original magmatic heat, we have restricted our map to a delineation of rocks
younger than 3 m.y. A separate report, also in press, tabulates the location and age of volcanic rocks younger than 5 m.y. for the region. A heat flow map of this region is also being constructed using all available data. This map will rely heavily on work by the USGS, Decker and his colleagues, and Reiter and his students.

Indirect evidence for possible elevated temperatures in the crust will be presented on two planned maps; one, a map showing the location of deep electrical conductors in the crust and the second, a depth to Curie point map. The electrical conductor map will be mainly a product of our own extensive, contracted MT work in Arizona and New Mexico. Because of the correlation between depth to electrical conductor and heat flow, it is hoped that this technique will eventually prove effective as a reconnaissance tool.

We anticipate eventually synthesizing the aeromagnetic data for the Arizona-New Mexico-Trans-Pecos area of Texas and compile a map for the region. This aeromagnetic map will then serve as a data source for generating a depth to Curie point map. Preliminary correlations in northwest Arizona between depth to Curie point, geothermal gradient, P-wave delay, seismic wave attenuation, and gravity suggest that the Curie point depth may also be useful as a reconnaissance technique.

Using all of the direct and indirect evidence we plan to develop a map showing depths to the 100°C and 150°C isotherms. Obviously this map will be of use to any geothermal explorationist.

The remaining maps in the series illustrate the stress-orientation, depth to potential reservoir rocks, seismicity, gravity, potential users, and the utility grid for this region.
The stress-orientation map builds on the recent map by Zoback and Zoback (1980) of the stress orientation throughout the United States. We have acquired considerably more data for the southwestern U.S. This map is being drafted at the present time and should be published this summer.

Work has begun on the depth to reservoir rock map and it is perhaps 30% finished. Hopefully it should be published in the fall.

Work on the remaining maps should begin during FY-82.
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Problems of Trace Element Ratios and Geothermometry in a Gravel Geothermal-Aquifer System

Sonderegger, J. L., and Donovan, J. J.

Introduction

The utilization of trace element concentrations and ratios of trace-elements to each other or to chloride in an attempt to understand the chemical evolution of a particular water was first applied to brines, seawater, and mineral springs (Rankama and Sahama, 1950, Chap. 6; Rubey, 1951; White, D. E., 1957). Tonani's (1970) overview paper on geochemical methods applied to geothermal exploration emphasized vapor phase separation of the volatiles hydrogen sulfide, ammonia, and boric acid; figure 1, from a more recent manuscript (Tonani, 1980), shows the fractionation of boron between liquid and vapor phases as a function of temperature. Attempting to utilize $B/Cl$, $Li/Cl$, and $B/Li$ ratios, without consideration of total concentration levels can result in misleading interpretations of relatively shallow thermal systems, which undergo a significant amount of dilution.

The system studied is a Tertiary-age, block-faulted basin in which a Pleistocene gravel bed acts as a confined aquifer and permits the lateral dispersion of the geothermal fluids. Vertical movement of the hot water is currently believed to be controlled by faults on the east side of the valley. An aerial magnetic anomaly (Geodata International, 1981, lines 300 and 320) and a Bouguer gravity anomaly (Donovan, et al., 1980) appear to correspond with these eastern faults. Basic data on the geology and trace element halos has been presented previously (Donovan, et al., 1980); figures 3, 4, and 5 from that article are reproduced below, along with the fluoride data (figure 2).

Evaluation of the mixing phenomena in this system was attempted using a dissolved silica-enthalpy graph. Figure 6 differs from most figures of this type in that a chalcedony curve is also plotted. Figure 7, an enthalpy versus chloride plot, suggests that either conductive cooling occurs before mixing or that higher chloride content background waters are available for mixing.
Ion Ratios from Various Sources

First let us consider the results of short-term leaching of volcanic rocks. The data used to construct Table 1 are from Ellis and Mahon (1977); the temperature was maintained at 250°C for two weeks, a rock/water ratio of 2 was used for all but the rhyolite pumice. For the pumice, a rock/water ratio of 1 was used by the experimenter, and in the absence of a 250°C experimental run, the values from the 200 and 300°C have been averaged. Values for F/Cl, B/Cl, and Li/B for the existing Camp Aqua well were 0.120, 0.020, and 0.136, respectively; these ratios suggested that the thermal potential might be greater than calculated, particularly if the chalcedony curve in figure 6 is used to estimate the reservoir temperature.

Table 2 compares ranges for ion ratios; the first three rows are from White (1957) and the second three rows are from Montana systems. At Ennis, a Na-HCO₃-SO₄ water with 120 mg/kg Cl and a surface temperature of 83°C, yields a 153°C Na-K-Ca-Mg reservoir temperature and a 135°C quartz reservoir temperature, assuming no mixing. A 540 foot well encountered 93°C water. At Warm Springs the surface temperature (77-78°C) agrees with the Na-K-Ca calculated 79.5°C, and chalcedony calculated value of 77.7°C. A 1,500 foot drill hole at Warm Springs encountered 78°C water. The Ennis system is in gneiss, while the Warm Springs system is in Tertiary(?) age valley fill materials and is probably fed by a Paleozoic limestone (high Ca and SO₄ content). The Camp Aqua data generally fit in the same order of magnitude for trace element ratios; however, the total dissolved solids content is less than half as great.

The test well in the Camp Aqua vicinity was drilled with state funds to evaluate a request for funding for a deep, large-diameter production well by a private concern. Table 3 contains chemical data and geothermometer calculations for well 211, (believed to represent the background water in the gravel aquifer), the Camp Aqua well, the test well in the gravel zone, and the test well in the bedrock zone. These data suggest to us that the 124°C source water projected from figure 6 may exist somewhere in the system and that dilution has had a greater effect on the quartz geothermometer than on the Na-K-Ca-Mg geothermometer.

A note of warning should be stressed at this point. Secondary calcite, and possibly dolomite, have been noted in the cuttings, both from the gravel and bedrock zones. Thus the correlation between the Na-K-Ca-Mg
Table 1. Ratios by weight of leach solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F/C1</th>
<th>B/C1</th>
<th>Li/Na</th>
<th>As(ppm)</th>
<th>H₂S(ppm)</th>
<th>Li/B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basalt</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dacite</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhyolite Pumice</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Approximate ranges of ion ratios from chloride dominated waters
(From White, 1957) and data from the Camp Aqua well and two springs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F/C1</th>
<th>B/Cl</th>
<th>Li/Na</th>
<th>As(ppm)</th>
<th>H₂S(ppm)</th>
<th>Li/B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ocean</td>
<td>7x10⁻⁵</td>
<td>2.4x10⁻⁴</td>
<td>10⁻⁵</td>
<td>2x10⁻³ - 1.7x10⁻²</td>
<td>0-60</td>
<td>N.L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil-field Brines</td>
<td>10⁻⁵ - 10⁻³</td>
<td>10⁻⁵ - 2x10⁻²</td>
<td>10⁻⁴ - 3x10⁻³</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0-3,000</td>
<td>N.L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volcanic Hot Springs</td>
<td>5x10⁻⁴ - 10⁻¹</td>
<td>10⁻² - 10⁻¹</td>
<td>3x10⁻³ - 3x10⁻²</td>
<td>10⁻¹ - 10⁻¹</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>N.L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Aqua</td>
<td>1.2x10⁻¹</td>
<td>2x10⁻²</td>
<td>5.7x10⁻⁴</td>
<td>---*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ennis</td>
<td>9.2x10⁻²</td>
<td>5x10⁻³</td>
<td>7.6x10⁻⁴</td>
<td>2.5x10⁻²</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm Springs</td>
<td>7.8x10⁻¹</td>
<td>2x10⁻²</td>
<td>3x10⁻³</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* halo from lower temperature wells up to 0.1 ppm
N.L. - Not Listed
--- - Data not available
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Ca</th>
<th>Mg</th>
<th>Na</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>SiO₂</th>
<th>Alka.</th>
<th>Cl</th>
<th>SO₄</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well LB-211</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well LB-32</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>152.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Well 264'</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>159.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>297*</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Well 324'</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>139.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>&lt;.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>Li</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>As</th>
<th>H₂S</th>
<th>Temp</th>
<th>TDS</th>
<th>Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well LB-211</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>&lt;.008</td>
<td>&lt;.09</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>&lt;.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well LB-32</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Well 264'</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Well 324'</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chalcedony</th>
<th>Quartz</th>
<th>Na-K-Ca-Mg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well LB-211</td>
<td>33°</td>
<td>-58°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well LB-32</td>
<td>66°</td>
<td>117°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Well 264'</td>
<td>68°</td>
<td>119°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Well 324'</td>
<td>60°</td>
<td>79°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Laboratory value
temperatures and the 124°C projection from figure 6 may be wholly fortuitous. It is our belief, at this time, that only the chalcedony curve in figure 6 can be used with any confidence, and that the 77°C source water is the more probable of the two. The trace element data ratios are probably, in part, controlled by fines (clays) within the gravel due mainly to ion exchange. At least one zeolite (either heulandite or clinoptilolite) has been detected in the bedrock cuttings (along with pyrite and chalcopyrite(?)). We are definitely looking at an old hydrothermal system. What is uncertain at the present time is whether the hydrothermal alteration and mineralization are related synoptically to the current hot water system, or whether the modern geothermal circulation systems simply following the same flow pathway followed by older (possibly Tertiary) hydrothermal fluids and intrusives.

Conclusions

The valley fill aquifer system in the vicinity of Camp Aqua is still poorly understood with respect to the temperature of source waters. For a low TDS (420 mg/kg) Na-HCO₃ water in valley fill materials it is advised that trace element ratios be used with great caution, and the absolute values of the trace elements and chloride must be considered. The role of cation (Li) and base (B) exchange by clays in a system affected by waning or prior hydrothermal alteration is not presently clear, and needs further study.
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Figure 1. Plot of boron fractionation between the liquid and vapor phases as a function of temperature (from Tonani, 1980).
Figure 2. F⁻ concentrations (mg/kg) in well waters.
Figure 3. Li⁺ concentrations (µg/kg) in well waters.
Figure 4. B concentrations (μg/kg) in well waters.
Figure 5. Cl⁻ concentrations (mg/kg) in well waters.
Figure 6. Enthalpy - SiO₂ plot of data from a typical background well (211) and the Camp Aqua well. The chalcedony curve has been added using data from Fournier (1980).
Figure 7. An enthalpy-chloride plot for waters from the gravel aquifer in the Camp Aqua vicinity.
HELIUM AND MERCURY IN THE CENTRAL SEWARD PENINSULA
RIFT SYSTEM, ALASKA

by

Eugene Wescott
Geophysical Institute
University of Alaska
Fairbanks, Alaska 99701

Abstract

The central Seward Peninsula, Alaska, has one known Geothermal Resource Area (KGRA) at Pilgrim Springs, and has recent volcanic flows, fault systems, topographic and tectonic features which can be explained by a rift model. As part of a geothermal reconnaissance of the area we used helium and mercury concentrations in soil as indicators of geothermal resources. The largest helium concentrations were found in the vicinity of the Pilgrim Springs KGRA, and indicate prime drilling sites. Profile lines were run across the suspected rift system. Significant helium anomalies were found on several of the traverses, where future exploration might be concentrated. Mercury values showed a great range of variability on the traverses, and seem unreliable as geothermal indicators except in the vicinity of the Pilgrim Springs. Permafrost at the surface resulting in variations in sampling depth may contribute to the mercury variations.

Introduction

Turner et al., 1981, have proposed "that an interconnected system of late Tertiary to Quaternary rifts and transform faults extends 250 km across the central Seward Peninsula from Port Clarence to the eastern Kayuk River Valley". The rift model appears to explain many late Tertiary to Quaternary topographic, structural, tectonic and volcanic features, and should be useful as an exploration model for geothermal energy resources. Figure 1 shows a diagram of the proposed rift system on a generalized geological map.

As part of a study of the Seward Peninsula geothermal energy potential during summer 1980, geological mapping, remote sensing, geophysical exploration and geochemical sampling methods were used to develop the rift model and search for geothermal resources. Previous work in 1979 at the Pilgrim Springs KGRA had delineated the near surface reservoir, which shallow drilling confirmed.

The Seward Peninsula covers approximately the same area as the state of West Virginia, but with very few roads. In order to search for evidence of other hidden geothermal resources in this large area we tried using helium and mercury in soil samples as indicators. Both have been reported as useful in exploration for geothermal areas and they can be sampled fairly rapidly and are inexpensive to analyse.
Helium anomalies near geothermal sites have been detected near geothermal sites throughout the world (Bergquist, 1979). Two factors may contribute to helium anomalies in conjunction with geothermal areas: The deep, nonatmospheric mixing source of most geothermal waters, and the radioactive decay of uranium and thorium in the vicinity of the source waters. Helium is unusual in that its solubility in water increases with temperature above 30°C [Figure 2 after Mazor (1972)]. Pressurized hot water will be a very efficient scavenger of helium produced by radioactive decay of uranium and thorium contained in the rocks at depth, and will release it as it rises towards the surface, cools and de-pressurizes. Since helium is highly mobile it will find faults, minute fractures and paths to rise to the surface. Some helium will be trapped in the rocks and sediments, but because its atomic structure is nearly spherical the entrapment is difficult (Bergquist, 1979).

We sampled the soil for helium in two ways: The first was to drive a probe 30 in. into the ground and draw off a ground gas sample which was then inserted into a small evacuated steel ampule and sealed for later analysis. This method does not work well in wet soil or where the soil is rocky or frozen. In such conditions we used a soil sampling auger to drill a hole 30 in deep. The soil core at the bottom was then quickly placed in a tin can and sealed. Western Systems, Inc., performed the helium analysis to a precision of 10 parts per billion. Normal atmospheric He concentration is 5.24 ppm, and any significant soil concentration above this is an anomaly.

Mercury content in soils has also been reported as a possible indicator of geothermal resources (Matlick and Buseck, 1975). They confirmed a strong association of Hg with geothermal activity in three of four areas tested (Long Valley, California; Summer Lake and Klamath Falls, Oregon). Mercury deposits typically occur in regions containing evidence of geothermal activity, such as hot springs (White, 1967).

Mercury is very volatile. The high vapor pressure makes it extremely mobile, and the elevated temperatures near a geothermal reservoir tend to increase this mobility. The Hg migrates upwards and outwards away from the geothermal reservoir, creating an aureole of enriched Hg in the soil above a geothermal reservoir larger in area than a corresponding helium anomaly.

We collected soil samples about 10 cm below the organic layer. The samples were air dried in the shade and sized to -80 fine using a stainless steel sieve. The -80 portions were stored in airtight glass vials for analysis. The Hg content of the sample was determined by use of a Jerome Instrument Corp., model 301 Gold Film Mercury detector with sensitivity to better than 0.1 ng of Hg. A standard volume of -80 mesh soil (0.25 cc) is placed in a quartz bulb and heated red hot for one minute to volatize all of the Hg, which is collected on a gold foil. Heating of the gold foil in the analysis procedure releases the Hg for analyses as a gas in the standard manner. Calibration is accomplished by inserting a known concentration of Hg vapor with a hypodermic syringe.
The background concentration of Hg in soils varies widely from area to area, and must be determined from a large number of samples. It is generally the order of 10 parts per billion.

A question remained as to the application of helium and mercury sampling to Alaska geothermal exploration: How does the presence of permafrost affect the diffusion of He and Hg from source to the soil surface? Further basic research on this problem is needed, but we do know that we found both He and Hg anomalies in both thawed and in thick permafrost areas.

Prior to the work on the Seward Peninsula rift system we tried both He and Hg sampling in the vicinity of Chena Hot Springs, Alaska. Figure 3 shows a map of Chena Hot Springs with isothermal contours at a depth of 0.5 m, and the soil concentrations of He and Hg in the area. A high value of 795 ppm He was found near the center of the 40°C isotherm at the west end of the area. In general the mercury values tended to outline the same linear anomaly presumed to be a fault in the underlying quartz monzonite crystalline rocks.

He and Hg Results in Central Seward Peninsula

In order to further assess the usefulness of He and Hg surveys some limited profiles were made in the approximately 1 km² thaw ellipse at Pilgrim Hot Springs. Figure 4 shows a map of Pilgrim Springs and the location of anomalous He samples. The highest soil concentrations of about 100 ppm He were found near, but not at the highest temperatures at 4.5 m depth (80°C). Figure 5 shows the T, He and Hg values along a profile west to east across the hottest temperature anomaly. In general the helium and mercury values are in agreement. Both are anomalously high at station 20°W which is suggested as a prime drilling site. Along a north-south profile on the 0.0 line the helium values were all close to atmospheric levels, yet a mercury anomaly of 55 ppb was found at a location where the ground temperature was only 20°C. Curiously samples next to the main hot springs pool were low in both He and Hg. The cause of this is likely due to the soil which is a porous sand, and the elevated temperature. The porosity of the soil could allow helium to readily pass through to the atmosphere. Mercury would be easily vaporized by the high temperature and also escape through the porous soil.

Some anomalous helium values were found outside the thaw ellipse across the Pilgrim river as shown in Figure 4. Galvanic and EM-16R resistivity measurements show low resistivity layers beneath the surface and suggest the presence of geothermal water in a band along the river.

There is a second smaller thaw window in the Pilgrim river valley 4 km ENE of Pilgrim Springs. The temperature at 4.5 m was 20°C. The He concentration in the soil was anomalous, 5.52 ppm, and Hg samples were indeterminate, some low some higher than normal. No drilling or deeper temperature measurements have been made, but resistivity measurements indicate a low resistivity layer of 2.5 Ω-m at depth.

As geological mapping progressed in 1980 the general outlines of a proposed rift system emerged. Except for the Nome Taylor Road, all access to the area was by helicopter or boat. Five traverse lines were planned.
to cross the elements of the rift system to measure gravity, geology, VLF, mercury and helium wherever possible. The limited helicopter and field time did not permit stations as closely spaced as might be desirable.

Figure 6 shows a map of the Seward Peninsula with the location of stations on the five traverse lines. Also shown are the locations of anomalous He soil concentrations found. With the exception of two small anomalies at the north end of the Imuruk Traverse, all the helium anomalies lie within the proposed rift sections A, B, C, or D (Figure 1). Helicopter flying range did not allow us to work farther to the east in segment E.

Figure 7 shows a geologic cross section, and the He and Hg concentrations along the Imuruk Traverse. There are two significant helium anomalies two km apart in the lava fields not far from the recent Lost Jim Flow. The Hg values are also high at these two stations.

Figure 8 shows a geologic cross section at the western end of the rift system where the highest helium anomaly on the traverses was located. The corresponding Hg soil concentration is about normal. On the traverse several large Hg anomalies were found, particularly in a small stream valley at station 128. The cause of this anomaly is not evident. At one time during the gold rush mercury was used to amalgamate the fine placer gold in streams. We tested a soil sample in Quartz Creek which was heavily mined and found the Hg content about average. There was no evidence of mining actively in the valley of station 128, or at 131 which was also anomalous. The Hg aureole is expected to be much larger than that around an He source, so the fact that no He anomaly was found at either station does not rule out a geothermal source of the Hg.

Space does not permit the inclusion of other traverses. In general however the Hg values showed great variability from one station to another, while the He values were almost all near background except for a few anomalies shown on Figure 6.

Conclusions

Our use of He and Hg in the study of the Central Seward peninsula was in part research into the usefulness of these geothermal associated elements. We found that both are probably useful in a hot springs or known thermal anomaly. However as reconnaissance tools we found that the Hg soil concentrations showed great variability. If we had made closer spaced measurements we might be able to explain the variability, but as it is we can only speculate. Perhaps the presence of permafrost affected the ability to collect samples at a uniform soil horizon. There are probably more varied sources of Hg in the rocks than it is the case for He. We found the He sampling produced anomalies in the rift zones, and several significant concentrations which indicate areas of interest for future geothermal exploration.
APPENDIX A

Geological Map Units

Q  Tertiary to Quaternary alluvium, valley fill, includes Kougarok gravels and equivalents, till and alluvium.

QTu  Tertiary to Quaternary gravels and equivalents, till and alluvium.

QTb  Tertiary to Quaternary basalts of the Kuzitrin Flats and Eva Mtn. Alkalic to Tholeiitic in composition with ultramafic inclusions in the alkali basalts.

Qb  Inclusions in the alkali basalts.

Ki  Cretaceous intrusives, mostly quartz monzonite.

Pz  Thrust sheets of Paleozoic carbonates and meta-carbonates.

Pzc

PG  Precambrian to lower paleozoic metasediments. Schists and gneisses of the Nome Group and York Slate. Locally migmatized.

PGms  in the Northern Bendeleben Mts.
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FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. Diagram of proposed rift model for the central Seward Peninsula. The graben structure offshore (PCR) is the Port Clarence Rift (Hopkins et al., 1974). The geology is generalized from Hudson (1977). QTb unit are late Tertiary to Quaternary basaltic lava flows. See Appendix A for geologic units.

Figure 2. Solubility of noble gases in fresh water (after Mazor, 1972).

Figure 3. Map of Chena Hot Springs, Alaska with 0.5 m depth isothermal contours, helium and mercury soil concentrations.

Figure 4. Map of Pilgrim Hot Springs, Alaska showing the elliptical area of thermally disturbed ground and anomalous He values found.

Figure 5. Temperature at 4.5 m depth, He and Hg soil concentrations in a west to east profile across the Pilgrim Hot Springs thaw ellipse.

Figure 6. Map of Seward Peninsula, Alaska showing 5 traverse lines across sections of the proposed rift system and locations of anomalous helium soil concentrations.

Figure 7. Imuruk traverse, helium and mercury soil concentrations. Two significant helium anomalies are found at stations 43 and 44. The mercury values are also higher than the mean at those sites. The nearby Lost Jim Flow is of very recent age. See Appendix A for geologic units.

Figure 8. Agiapuk traverse, helium and mercury soil concentrations. A significant helium anomaly was found at station 123 near lava flows of probable Tertiary age. Two large Hg anomalies were also found without He concentrations. See Appendix A for geologic map units.
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Identification of truly thermal springs is an indispensable aid in the assessment of a region's geothermal characteristics. Over the years numerous lists of thermal springs in Arizona have been compiled and we present yet another. Although the word thermal implies heat, there is considerable subjectivism or arbitrariness in its application. In geothermal work what is important is anomalous or unusual heat—something above a norm. I have devised a functional scheme useful in identifying those Arizona springs judged to be carrying anomalous heat. The method is readily applied to any new springs that may be encountered. The results of this updated version are shown in Table 1. Also, possible heat sources are briefly outlined in the text.

Defining Thermal Springs

Over the years, springs given the label "thermal" may or may not carry anomalous heat. Likewise, it is possible for springs not so labeled to be anomalously warm. The explanation for this is not difficult; it is to be found in Arizona's regional topographic-climatic variances.

Depending upon the season, the temperature of the earth down to 10 or 20 meters is slightly above or below the mean annual air temperature (MAT). Because springs are surface discharges of water contained in the pores and fractures of rock at very shallow depth, springs tend to have a temperature
close to the MAT. Spring temperatures that are much higher than the MAT are thermal springs and their waters are heated by anomalously hot rock near the surface or by circulation through hot rock at much greater depths.

The MAT in Arizona ranges from less than 6°C to over 22°C, primarily because the surface elevation is quite varied; therefore, a similar range in spring temperatures is to be expected. Generally, a thermal spring at a high elevation will have a lower temperature than an equally significant thermal spring at a lower elevation where the MAT is higher. Thus, the MAT provides a baseline from which a thermal spring can be defined from place to place.

However, in order to actually classify a spring as being thermal, some comparisons, or temperature standard above the baseline temperature, is needed. This comparison temperature should fall somewhere between normal spring temperatures and those that are anomalously high and obviously thermal. The temperature distribution of Arizona's springs relative to the mean annual air temperature (MAT) is utilized to find this comparison temperature.

Spring temperatures measured during field work and reported in geologic literature covering Arizona were compiled. All available MAT data for Arizona were plotted and contoured on a map of Arizona in order to determine the MAT at the spring locations. The MAT for individual spring locations is subtracted from the individual measured spring temperatures and plotted
on a frequency diagram in Figure (1). A mostly normal distribution of spring temperatures relative to the MAT is evident. The mean spring temperature is slightly above the MAT. This mean spring temperature relates to the average circulation depth of these waters below the surface.

However, the distribution is not perfectly normal when all springs in Arizona are considered. Actually, the distribution appears to have two means with similar standard deviations. When the mean spring temperature of the Basin and Range province is compared to the mean spring temperature of the Colorado Plateau province (Figure 2), a bimodal mean spring temperature is evident, the former being the higher. If the same average circulation depth and average rock thermal conductivities are assumed for both provinces, the difference may relate to the higher conductive heat flow observed in the Basin and Range province. If this is true, the higher mean spring temperature of the Basin and Range springs is caused by a higher average subsurface temperature gradient. It should be pointed out that other explanations are plausible such as differences in surface vegetative cover, average spring flow rates, and seasonal recharge.

The apparent deviation of spring temperatures below the means, assuming a normal distribution, is believed to be caused by discharge from perched water tables close to recharge sources and not discharge from the static water table.

Thermal waters may be subdivided arbitrarily into "hot"
and "warm." Hot springs for all of Arizona are here defined as those having temperatures that exceed the MAT by the sum of the mean spring temperature for all springs and the standard deviation (Figure 1). Thus, the comparison temperature used to define a hot spring is $15^\circ C$ above a spring's MAT. In the Basin and Range province the comparison temperature used to define a "warm spring" is $10^\circ C$ above the appropriate MAT. For the Colorado Plateau province $6^\circ C$ above the MAT defines a "warm spring" (Figure 2). These definitions apply only to Arizona and may vary in other states having different geological terrains and subsurface geophysical properties.

Origin of Thermal Springs

Thermal springs, as herein defined, originate from a combination of special conditions. These conditions are basic elements in any geothermal system and they have to work in concert before a system can exist naturally. These elements are: (1) a heat source; (2) a recharge source; (3) a circulation framework or storage reservoir; and (4) a discharge mechanism.

The most basic element is the heat source because it alone separates geothermal spring systems from all others. In Arizona, igneous heat sources are tentatively ruled out because no Recent or Pleistocene silicic volcanism is known. Silicic magma is very viscous and tends to collect in large shallow storage sites. These bodies of magma contain enormous quantities of heat and may require several hundred thousand years
to cool to ambient temperature, thereby providing significant heat to overlying rocks and contained fluids.

Recent and Pleistocene basaltic volcanism is known in Arizona; but intrusions related to this volcanism are small plugs, dikes and sills, because basaltic magma is very fluid. Small plugs, dikes and sills cool to ambient temperature in a few months or years and contribute only minor quantities of heat to the surrounding rocks.

The normal flow of heat from the earth's interior is probably the major source of heat for Arizona's thermal springs. Because the earth's internal heat flows or conducts through rock toward the surface, subsurface temperatures in Arizona generally increase at least 30°C for every kilometer of depth; therefore, water circulating deeper than 300 meters for a period of time will be heated by subsurface rocks a minimum of 10°C above the MAT on the surface. Provided little loss of heat occurs on the way back to the surface, these circulating waters will discharge as thermal springs.

The detailed mechanics and geologic conditions required for deep circulation of water are beyond the scope of this article. However, it is believed that forced convection accounts for Arizona's thermal springs because the vertical permeabilities in fault zones and Arizona's subsurface temperature gradients are too low for free convection. Free convection is buoyant flow of water caused by a temperature-induced vertical differential in water density. Forced con-
vection is pressure-induced water flow caused by elevation differences between the recharge water table and the springs discharge elevation. Deep forced convection requires special structures, stratigraphic geometries and geohydrologic conditions.

Studies of Arizona's thermal springs are but a part of the Arizona Bureau of Geology and Mineral Technology's assessment and characterization of Arizona's geothermal resources. The entire study is being funded by the U.S. Department of Energy.
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# THERMAL SPRINGS OF ARIZONA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>T°C</th>
<th>T-MAT°C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Warm Spring</td>
<td>A-1-20-12AC (unsurv.)</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hanna Creek Hot Springs</td>
<td>A-1-31-29AD</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Warm Spring</td>
<td>A-4%-20-36CB (unsurv.)</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>White River Salt Spring</td>
<td>A-4%-20-35AD (unsurv.)</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Roosevelt Dam Hot Spring</td>
<td>A-4-12-19DB</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hot Spring</td>
<td>A-9-6-26AB (unsurv.)</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Verde Hot Springs</td>
<td>A-11-6-3B</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Salado Spring</td>
<td>A-12-28-17DCA</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Henderson Ranch Spring</td>
<td>B-8-1-33BAC</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Alkalai Spring</td>
<td>B-8-1-33DB</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Castle Hot Springs</td>
<td>B-8-1-34CC</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kaiser Hot Spring</td>
<td>B-14-12-10AD</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cofer Hot Spring</td>
<td>B-16-13-25CAD</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Warm Spring</td>
<td>B-18-13-25DB</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Warm Spring</td>
<td>B-18-19-33DC</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>B-20-9-30CC</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hot Spring</td>
<td>B-30-23-15CBD</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hot Spring</td>
<td>B-30-23-26BCD</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pakoon Spring</td>
<td>B-35-16-24BD</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Agua Caliente Spring</td>
<td>C-5-10-19AA</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Radium Hot Spring</td>
<td>C-8-18-12CC</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>D-2-31-35ABB (unsurv.)</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mescal Warm Spring</td>
<td>D-3-17-20CDBC</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Coolidge Dam Hot Spring</td>
<td>D-3-18-17DC</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Miguel Raton Spring</td>
<td>D-3-31-3ADC</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>D-4-23-21AA</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>D-4-23-21AD</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Tom Niece Spring</td>
<td>D-4-23-22BD</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Eagle Creek Hot Spring</td>
<td>D-4-28-35ABB</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Clifton Hot Spring</td>
<td>D-4-30-18CCCD</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Clifton Hot Spring</td>
<td>D-4-30-18CDC</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Clifton Hot Spring</td>
<td>D-4-30-19CAA</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Clifton Hot Spring</td>
<td>D-4-30-30DBC</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Warm Spring</td>
<td>D-5-19-23BDD</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Indian Hot Springs</td>
<td>D-5-24-17AD</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>D-5-24-16CB</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Gillard Hot Spring</td>
<td>D-5-29-27AAD</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>D-7-24-13DC</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>D-10-29-23DD</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>D-12-21-31CA</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Agua Caliente Spring</td>
<td>D-13-16-20CDD</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Hookers Hot Spring</td>
<td>D-13-21-6AAC</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Agua Caliente Spring</td>
<td>D-20-13-13BA</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Antelope Spring</td>
<td>D-20-24-21DC</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Monkey Spring</td>
<td>D-21-16-3C</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TEMPERATURE DISTRIBUTION OF ARIZONA SPRINGS
RELATIVE TO MEAN ANNUAL AIR TEMPERATURE

Number of springs - 246
Mean - 6.55
Standard deviation - 8.34

Figure 1 SPRING TEMPERATURE MINUS MEAN ANNUAL AIR TEMPERATURE (°C)
A COMPARISON OF TEMPERATURE DISTRIBUTION OF SPRINGS IN THE
COLORADO PLATEAU AND BASIN AND RANGE PROVINCES

Colorado Plateau

- Number of springs: 121
- Mean: 2.91
- Standard deviation: 2.66
- Hot springs not included

Basin and Range Province

- Number of springs: 71
- Mean: 5.97
- Standard deviation: 3.37
- Hot springs not included

Figure 2:
MERCURY SOIL SURVEYS: A GOOD RECONNAISSANCE TOOL

Mercury geochemical soil sampling has proven to be a useful tool in determining subsurface geologic structure in the Basin and Range province of Arizona. Limited studies indicate that mercury vapor leakage along buried geologic structures is reflected in anomalously higher mercury concentrations in soil samples above the structures. The mercury anomalies reflect subsurface structures that are usually identified by gravity and seismic surveys. Therefore, when feasible, mercury soil sampling can easily and economically be substituted for geophysical surveys during a geothermal reconnaissance assessment in undisturbed basins in the Basin and Range province.

The mercury soil samples are generally collected at one-mile spacings at section corners, but have also been collected at half-mile and quarter-mile intervals. Sample spacing depends upon the size of the project area and what is to be defined by the survey. If one-mile spacings are inadequate, additional sampling at closer intervals is easily accomplished to improve resolution and coverage.

The sampling technique is simple and fast. Soil horizons, as developed in moist or wet climates, do not exist in the Basin and Range province of Arizona. Therefore, when taking the sample the first four or five inches of soil and organic material are removed, and two or three handfuls of bare,
mineral soil are scooped into a plastic, ziplock sandwich bag. The sample bag is carefully sealed and labelled.

The samples are sent to a commercial laboratory where they are air dried inside the laboratory, sieved to the minus-80-mesh fraction, and analyzed. Air drying of the samples in the laboratory is important as sunlight tends to drive off the mercury vapor.

It is important to sample the same depth zone at each sample site since the results of a mercury survey are only relative. It is also important that the samples are kept away from direct sunlight, when stored for any length of time. We statistically estimate the mean mercury concentration for a given area and use all values greater than the mean plus one standard deviation to indicate an "anomalous" high value.

Three examples of mercury soil surveys are discussed, along with the gravity data. In the Avra Valley study, the gravity indicates a rather large alluvial-covered structure trending northwest from the southeast corner of the map (Fig. 1). The results of the mercury soil survey mirror this structure. The stippled area on the map indicates the geochemically anomalous area. These two linear patterns (gravity and mercury) define the Silver Bell-Bisbee discontinuity (Titley, 1976), a major mineralized lineament active in the Laramide and mid-Tertiary (Rehrig and Heidrick, 1976). In addition Lepley (1978) was able to define portions of this
lineament using satellite imagery.

Figure 2 is from the San Pedro Valley study. In this area the gravity reflects the thick sequence of volcanic rocks in the basin that apparently mask most of the geologic structures. The results of the mercury soil survey also do not reflect geologic structures in the basement. Again, there is good correlation between the gravity data and the reconnaissance mercury soil survey.

The third survey site was in the northern Hassayampa Plain. The mercury soil survey (Fig. 3) reflects the northwest-trending range-bounding fault, as well as north-south and northeast-trending structures. At one-mile spacings the mercury soil survey clearly indicates gross subsurface structures suitable for a reconnaissance assessment. The survey provided realistic structural targets for the gravity survey to refine. Gravity data in this area were so sparse that it was necessary to run a gravity survey (Fig. 4). This more refined survey reveals a sinuous pediment edge that suggests en echelon(?) faulting. The north-south and northwest-trending structures seen in the mercury survey are also shown by the gravity survey.

We do not use mercury soil concentrations to identify geothermal anomalies for two reasons: (1) high mercury concentrations are also indicative of fossil geothermal systems; and (2) the high incidence of placer gold mining operations that used mercury for amalgamation have possibly contaminated large areas in the Arizona Basin and Range province. In both
instances high mercury concentrations would erroneously suggest geothermal anomalies.

In summary, we have found an excellent correlation in southern Arizona between buried structures revealed by gravity and mercury soil surveys. The latter type of survey has several advantages over the former as a reconnaissance tool: (1) location and elevation control are not critical; (2) nearly anyone can be trained to collect samples; (3) inexpensive; (4) fast; and (5) easy.
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Figure 1. Mercury soil survey, Avra Valley, Arizona.
Figure 2. Mercury soil survey, San Pedro Valley, Arizona.
Map showing mercury concentration (ppb) in soil samples

Figure 3. Mercury soil survey, Hassayampa Plain, Arizona.
Figure 4. Bouguer gravity anomaly map, Hassayampa Plain, Arizona.
Two of the most interesting geothermal assessments conducted by the California Division of Mines and Geology, as part of the U.S. Department of Energy's State Coupled Program, include studies of the Calistoga area completed in the 1979-80 project year and of the Los Angeles County area, in progress in the 1980-81 project year. The following are brief summaries and comments on the findings in each of the two areas.

Calistoga Area

The Calistoga, California area contains a hydrogeothermal field exceeding 20°C, covering about 15 square kilometers of valley lands which are geologically evaluated to determine the extent and magnitude of the heat resources. The geological study was conducted by the California Division of Mines and Geology in 1980, with funding provided by the Federal Department of Energy and the State of California.

Geological, geophysical, and geochemical techniques were used in the area and these were subsequently supplemented by a small drilling program. Three holes were drilled using the dual tube drilling technique with the deepest hole reaching a final depth of 885 feet. The dual tube method has, as distinct advantages over ordinary drilling techniques, the ability to pinpoint aquifers down to a few inches in thickness and to obtain uncontaminated samples of both water and rock types as drilling proceeds.

The investigations revealed that as many as seven distinct aquifers contribute heated water to this field. The aquifers extend vertically through an average 85 meter thick sequence of permeable alluvial sands and gravels, interbedded with impermeable clay and volcanic ash units. The top of the uppermost thermal aquifer averages about 35 meters below the ground surface. The maximum temperature recorded from the reservoir is 135°C, which supports the estimated maximum temperature of 140°C, that was derived by the Division using geothermometric calculation. Geophysical results indicate the possible location of a heat source for this area, and a possible 15 square kilometer extension of the field, in the upland area to the southwest of the valley.

The Calistoga area contains a small community associated with the wine industry of Napa Valley, and it is noted for its spas and bottled mineral water. Direct heat applications of hydrogeothermal fluids have long been made here for residential and commercial uses. The results of this study will assist in the further efficient development of the field while permitting the maintenance of the geothermal energy source, and will facilitate development of the field with minimal environmental degradation.
Los Angeles County Area

The 73 oil fields of Los Angeles County were studied by the California Division of Mines and Geology under contract to the U.S. Department of Energy to determine if waters produced from oil fields can be considered as sources of thermal energy for non-electrical applications adjacent to the fields. The oil fields lie in two areas, the Los Angeles Basin and the Ventura Basin. The Los Angeles Basin has more potential for applications because of its large population and greater number of fields; most fields are in densely developed commercial-industrial or residential areas which could provide numerous applications.

Data from a canvass of 40 oil field operators in the county indicates that large quantities of warm-to-hot water are produced from fields in the south and central portions of the Los Angeles Basin. Temperatures range from ambient air to boiling, but most are in the 35°-60°C range. The temperatures largely reflect the normal geothermal gradient -- the increase of temperature with depth -- rather than an anomalous heat source under the basin. Production is mainly from depths of about 1000-2000 meters; water quality ranges from about 5,000 to 40,000 mg/liter total dissolved solids.

Many operators believe that extraction of heat from the waters is technologically feasible, although several cite economics and detrimental effects on oil viscosity as possible hindrances. Most operators agree that the most favorable and least disruptive sites for heat extraction would be the water-collection and treatment facilities for each field. The facilities are generally centralized in the fields and could serve as points of distribution for the heat produced.
A SUMMARY OF D.O.E. FUNDED GEOTHERMAL RESOURCE ASSESSMENT EFFORTS IN COLORADO BY THE COLORADO GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

by

Richard Howard Pearl, Ted. G. Zacharakis, and Frank R. Repplier

Colorado Geological Survey

Denver, Colorado.

INTRODUCTION

For the past 3 1/2 years the Colorado Geological Survey has been evaluating the geothermal resources of select thermal areas in the State. Efforts have been directed towards defining the geology, hydrogeology and geothermal characteristics of those thermal areas deemed to have immediate development potential. The areas evaluated were selected in conjunction with the Colorado Commercialization Project, which is also a part of the Colorado Geological Survey offices.

The resource assessment program of the Colo. Geol. Survey has been a fully integrated exploration and assessment program consisting of: geological mapping where necessary but primarily the compilation of existing geological mapping data; hydrogeological mapping data; soil mercury surveys; gradient drilling; reservoir confirmation drilling; and geophysical surveys such as electrical resistivity, telluric, AMT, and seismic. Not all of the above have been run at each area. Following is a brief description of the work performed at each individual area.

AREAS EVALUATED

A) Pagosa Springs, located in southwestern Colorado (Fig. 1). Geological and hydrogeological mapping, seismic and dipole-dipole geophysical surveys, gradient drilling, reservoir confirmation drilling, and soil mercury surveys.

B) San Luis Valley, south central Colorado (Fig. 1). Wide variety of surveys in different parts of the Valley.
   1. Shaws Springs area on the west side of the Valley (Fig. 1). Compilation of previous geological mapping; seismic, electrical resistivity, AMT and Telluric geophysical surveys and soil mercury surveys.
   2. Central part of the Valley north of Alamosa (Fig. 1). Gradient hole drilling.

C) Canon City Embayment area (Fig. 1). Program was designed to locate a source of thermal waters for the Dept. of Corrections prison complex. Soil Mercury surveys; gradient drilling; compilation of previous geological mapping and seismic, electrical resistivity, AMT and telluric geophysical surveys.

D) Idaho Springs, 30 miles west of Denver (Fig. 1). Area evaluated primarily due to efforts of the Commercialization Team. Soil mercury survey; electrical resistivity survey and compilation of previous geological mapping plus reconnaissance geological mapping.

E) Glenwood Springs, located approximately 150 miles west of Denver on the Colorado River (Fig. 1). Seismic and dipole-dipole geophysical surveys.
F) Hartsel Hot Springs in South Park west of Colorado Springs (Fig. 1). Electrical resistivity geophysical survey; soil mercury survey and compilation of previous geological mapping.

G) Ranger Hot Springs north of Gunnison (Fig. 1). Area still under evaluation. Following work either has been done or will be done during the summer of 1981: electrical resistivity geophysical survey; soil mercury survey and geological and hydrogeological mapping.

H) Animas Valley north of Durango in southwestern Colorado (Fig. 1). Soil Mercury; electrical resistivity survey and compilation of existing geological mapping with field checking and revision where necessary.

I) Ouray on north side of San Juan Mountains (Fig. 1). Area evaluated due to efforts of the Commercialization Team. Electrical resistivity surveys; soil mercury surveys and compilation of existing geological mapping.

J) Hot Sulphur Springs in northcentral Colorado (Fig. 1). Area still under evaluation. Soil mercury surveys have been run and geological appraisal completed. Electrical resistivity surveys to be run during summer of 1981.

K) Steamboat Springs in northwest Colorado (Fig. 1). Area still under evaluation. Soil mercury surveys completed. Electrical resistivity survey and a hydrogeological thesis will be done during the summer of 1981.

L) Wagon Wheel Gap on the east side of the San Juan Mountains (Fig. 1). The area is still under evaluation, with electrical resistivity surveys to be run during the summer of 1981.

In addition the following items have been completed or are in preparation.


B) Evaluation of lineament structures of Colorado as noted on satellite imagery and their relation to thermal springs of Colorado.

C) Map of groundwater temperatures in Colorado.

D) Geothermal gradient map of Colorado constructed from maximum temperatures recorded in oil and gas wells.

E) Thermal mine water drainage will be evaluated during summer of 1981. Project being done at request of Commercialization Team.

F) Waunita Hot Springs east of Gunnison. AMAX recently dropped their geothermal leases in the area and released all their exploration maps and reports to the public. The Colorado Resource Assessment Team will publish these maps and reports.
SUCCESSES AND FAILURES

During the course of the investigations listed above a number of successes and failures were encountered. Following is a brief description of them.

Successes

A) Geophysical surveys: In most instances the geophysical surveys ran were successful. However in several important instances serious problems were encountered. They will be discussed in detail later in the paper.

AMT and Telluric geophysical surveys were conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey in the San Luis Valley and the Canon City Embayment areas. The surveys obtained good results and data; However for a complete understanding of the data it has to be used in conjunction with other geophysical surveys and subsurface geological mapping.

Electrical resistivity surveys: The Colorado Geological Survey has a Syntrex RAC-8 electrical resistivity system. This is a good system but it does have some limitations, the primary being that it is limited in the depth that it will penetrate. If this limitation is taken into consideration during the planning of the project then it does not become a serious problem. In most of the areas where the equipment was used, good results were obtained.

B) Gradient measurements: The Colorado Resource Assessment Team now has two deep hole temperature probes available. A Fluid Dynamics System was acquired because of its accuracy and portability. Good results have been obtained using this system. The other system is truck mounted and upon use the probe was found to be not very accurate. Modification of the probe with the assistance of the Wyoming Resource Assessment Team has resulted in measurements of greater accuracy.

C) Bottomhole temperatures from oil and gas wells: Due to the great number of oil and gas test wells drilled in Colorado and the fact that copies of all electric logs run have to be filed with the Colo. Oil and Gas Conservation Commission this program is progressing very well. Data was obtained from all sedimentary basins in the State. While there are obvious inherent errors in using this data it is felt that it will present a good general picture of the geothermal gradients in Colorado.

D) Groundwater temperatures: This is another program that has progressed very well. The Colorado Geological Survey was able to acquire copies of the U.S. Geol. Survey WATSTORE data bank tapes. These tapes, plus other data sources provided temperatures for approximately 7,000 water wells in Colorado. Field verification of anomalous temperatures was required in some instances. This data will be used to construct a map which will be useful for users of groundwater heat pumps.

Failures

A) Soil Mercury: Probably the single greatest disappointment encountered by the Colo. Assessment Team has been the failure of soil mercury geochemical sampling techniques. Researchers at the Univ. of Utah Research Inst. and Jerome Inst. have been successful in showing that the mercury content of soils in geothermal areas is a viable geothermal exploration technique. Based on the above, the Colorado Resource Assessment Team obtained a Jerome Inst. Gold Film Mercury analyzer in 1979 and initiated a program of sampling in select thermal areas. Using sampling and analysis techniques developed by previous workers, The Colo. Team, working in areas where thermal waters exist and other areas where there were no thermal waters, was able to locate only a couple of
geothermal anomalies in two summers of use and these were in close proximity to thermal waters. In attempting to obtain viable results a number of sampling methods were employed; various traverses and grid profiles were used. Soil profiles were run with samples collected based on these profiles, in other instances samples were collected at specified intervals, also random samples collected, or samples were collected from two or more closely spaced holes. No matter what methods were employed in a thermal area, usually only a single anomalous value would be obtained, and that from the vicinity of the hot spring. Quite obviously the method is not proving to be of any value when only a known thermal spring can be located. After reexamination of previously published data and our results, the Colo. Team came to the conclusion that the geothermal systems in Colorado are either too old or too cold. Perhaps soil mercury surveys are not applicable in the old, cooler systems found in Colorado.

B) Geophysics: Another disappointment encountered was the inability to obtain good seismic geophysical data along the west side of the San Luis Valley. In the San Luis Valley basaltic lava flows and other eruptive materials are close to the surface. A contract was entered into with Geophysics Fund, Inc., the consulting geophysical group from the Colorado School of Mines to run seismic geophysical surveys in the San Luis Valley. Even though Geophysics Funds Inc. has had extensive experience working in a volcanic rock terrain due to the adsorptive nature of the volcanic rocks they were unable to acquire any good quality reflective data. The Colorado Team has extensively discussed this problem and no conclusion thus far has been reached on how this seismic problem could have been resolved. The contractor was chosen for his expertise and it is assumed that proper techniques were employed.

CONCLUSION

Analysis has shown that the geothermal resources of Colorado are primarily low to moderate temperature hydrothermal resources. As such their use will be limited to direct use applications. To aid potential developers of these resources the Colorado Geological Survey, in cooperation with the U.S. Dept. of Energy, in 1977 initiated a program to fully evaluate the geological and hydrogeological environment of those thermal areas in Colorado which have a high development potential. This program has been a fully integrated resource assessment program, consisting of: Geological and hydrogeological mapping, geophysical and geochemical surveys and gradient drilling and measurements. Even though this program has had mixed results it is believed that valuable information on the occurrence and geological conditions of the geothermal resources of Colorado has been obtained. Upon conclusion of this program in 1982 those areas considered to have high development potential will have been evaluated, to some degree. This information should be of aid to potential developers.
Several new studies were begun in 1980; these include a microearthquake survey on Maui and detailed gravity and magnetic coverage of small areas on Maui and Hawaii. The major effort of the geophysics subprogram is still the development and application of electrical resistivity techniques. To this end, modeling and inversion computer programs were either written by us or were obtained from other groups and adapted to our needs. Reports covering the major surveys of Maui and Hawaii, in which electrical methods were used predominantly, have recently been written and are now being reviewed. Also in 1980, two small-scale EM techniques were evaluated for a new application as regional geothermal reconnaissance tools.

Work was not restricted to geophysics. As an aid to those who wish to study large amounts of groundwater chemistry data that may or may not be very precise, some simple statistical discrimination procedures were applied to the Hawaii groundwater data. Results are presently incomplete; however, a set of geothermal discriminators have been identified that both confirm previous ideas and also suggest new relationships.

I. Microearthquake Location Mapping

During the period from July to September 1980, a preliminary microseismic monitoring survey was conducted on the island of Maui. The objectives of this survey were to both conduct a field test of the recently modified microprocessor controlled seismic packages as well as to attempt to locate areas of anomalous seismicity on Maui. A total of eleven seismic instrument packages were deployed on Maui which provided sufficient coverage to detect any event near the island having a magnitude of 2.5 or greater.

All of the seismic packages worked reliably throughout the field test, however, late delivery of high stability oscillators required for accurate determination of arrival times precluded the precise location of more than a few of the detected seismic events. Figure 1 presents a map of the locations of the stations that provided reliable times as well as the locations of three seismic events which occurred during this survey. It is interesting to note that one of the three events is located close to Ukumehame canyon which is also the site of a significant resistivity anomaly. Another significant result may be the absence of seismic activity in the Makena-La Perouse Bay area, which is the location of the most recent (1790) eruption on Maui. However, a longer period of coverage is clearly necessary in both of these areas before it will be possible to draw any significant conclusions concerning their thermal potential.

II. Gravity and Magnetic Mapping

Detailed gravity and magnetic field surveys were conducted on all the rift zones of interest on Maui as well as in the Kawaihae area on the island of Hawaii. Over 450 gravity stations and 10 miles of magnetic profile (at 30-meter intervals) were obtained. Detailed analysis of these data are presently under way, however, several preliminary interpretations can be drawn from the initial results.
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The first is that the gravity data obtained are consistent with the results of an earlier, less detailed statewide survey, although the more recent data have also delineated additional small-scale features associated with the rift zones. Modeling of these features should provide valuable information on the subsurface density structure near the rift zones.

Analysis of the magnetic data has been substantially more difficult due to large disturbances in the local magnetic field arising from near surface features such as highly-magnetized boulders or small-scale topographic effects. However, in several instances, signals have wavelengths as long as 1 km have been recognized. Work is in progress to filter out the near surface effects so as to model the deeper structures.

III. Computer Software Development

(1) Three-dimensional Resistivity Program

The program "RES3D" obtained from the U. C. Berkeley group was successfully adapted to run on the department's HARRIS computer. Since this program requires large amounts of CPU time (up to 1 hour/model), the low cost of the HARRIS makes it possible for us to experiment with several models of geothermal interest. Work in 1980 was concentrated on testing convergence criteria using standard one-dimensional models. However, the program is now performing satisfactorily for the purpose of computing Schlumberger apparent resistivities.

(2) One-dimensional Schlumberger Forward Problem

A program was adapted to run on a TI 58 hand calculator, making it possible to calculate apparent resistivities with reasonable accuracy in the field. A BASIC program was also adapted to run on the new APPLE III microcomputer. This program also provides a graphical output, making it extremely useful for checking the results of the different inversions described below.

(3) Schlumberger Inversion

Three separate inversion routines are now running on the department's HARRIS computer. The first, "MARQDCLAG" was written by Walt Anderson of the U. S. Geological Survey. The second, "SLUMB", was obtained from the Utah Geothermal group at UURI. The third program was adapted from a magnetotelluric inversion routine written by B. Lienert at HIG. This last routine has several significant advantages over the two routines already mentioned. The first is that it converges rapidly, even when no starting model is given. Secondly, it gives quantitative information on the amount of resolution which the data is capable of providing. This is extremely important, especially when problems of equivalence are encountered in thin layers.

An example of an inversion of data obtained on one of the Maui transects is given in Figures 2 and 3.
IV. D. C. Resistivity Sounding on Maui

The coverage achieved in 1979 was extended with soundings in the Haiku area on Maui. Two more soundings were also performed in the vicinity of Ukumehame Canyon. The results of the Ukumehame soundings confirmed the low resistivity values obtained in 1979. This area is undoubtedly the most promising one on the basis of the resistivity data.

Late in 1980 two soundings were performed on wilderness transects which were used by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife for a survey of native bird populations. These two soundings formed a good trial for the practicality of performing resistivity soundings in remote areas where vehicular access is impossible. Although the soundings were both performed successfully, we concluded that they would prove extremely expensive and time-consuming as a reconnaissance technique, and should only be attempted when considered absolutely vital. Although neither of the soundings were able to penetrate down to sea level, useful data was obtained on the resistivity structure of the upper kilometer in two areas which are almost certainly representative of large portions of East Maui.

V. Electromagnetic and Resistivity Sounds on Hawaii

A technical report entitled "Geophysical Evaluation of Prospective Geothermal Areas on the Island of Hawaii Using Electrical Methods" has been written and is presently under review. The following is a summary of the findings in six exploration areas on Hawaii:

(1) Kawaihae

The strongest evidence for subsurface heat is the high temperature in water wells in the area. Most are between 26 and 28°C; one well between the towns of Kawaihae and Waimea has a temperature of 37°C. The goal of our investigations was to discover the source of this heat. Previously gathered geologic, electric, and magnetic data pointed to the Kohala volcanics to the north and east of the warm-water well. The youngest lava flow in this area has been dated by K/Ar methods to be 80,000 years old.

Additional electrical soundings around the warm-water well yielded only a little additional information, mostly due to the method's inability to penetrate the water-saturated rocks below sea level; however, one sounding just east of the warm-water well revealed a possibly resistive horizon at depths which should have appeared conductive. This sounding was done over a large, complex magnetic anomaly. Our evidence is only suggestive; however, delineation of an anomalously magnetized, anomalously resistive body in this particular region would essentially be delineation of an intrusive body and a possible source of heat.
Deep EM soundings would answer many questions about the Kawaihae area regarding the location and size of the heat resource. TDEM soundings were tried, but failed because of problems in obtaining large enough currents in a grounded-wire source. The ash covering most of this area is very fine and dry and electrical grounding is very difficult in it. Future EM work should probably be done with an ungrounded source.

(2) Hualalai

The only evidence for subsurface heat here is circumstantial; the volcano has erupted in at least two locations along its northwest rift in the past 200 years. Hualalai is a rather large exploration target — fortunately, previous studies have been completed which effectively rule out the north and southeast rift zones as geothermal resources, at least to depths of 2 km. Our efforts were concentrated on the summit and northwest rift zones; the work consisted of D.C. electric and TDEM soundings.

Moderately low resistivities were discovered beneath the lower portion of the northwest rift at depths between 300 m and 3 km. The actual resistivity values are about twice as high as those found in the Puna KGRA suggesting that this may not be a high temperature resource. Low resistivities were also discovered beneath the summit region, but these may only reflect high-level groundwater that may or may not be warm. Our results are inconclusive on this point.

(3) South Point

Preliminary evidence for heat is only slightly more convincing for this area than it was for Hualalai; the southwest rift zone of Mauna Loa runs through the middle of this area and has erupted numerous times in the past 200 years. The vent locations for these eruptions have generally moved uprift or away from the coast in this time. Aerial infrared surveys have detected warm water flowing into the ocean where the rift intersects the coast and have outlined thermal anomalies on a west-facing fault scarp within the rift.

A previous study to the east of this fault scarp did not detect any anomalously low resistivities. Further information obtained from electric soundings farther uprift also did not detect resistivity anomalies. At this time, prospects for a geothermal resource in this area are not good; however, the area to the west of the fault scarp has not yet been explored.

(4) Southwest Rift of Kilauea

Again, the many eruptions in the past 200 years suggest that residual heat may be present in this area. Warm water is known from only one coastal spring. Previous studies have mapped the boundaries of a high-level water body which borders this rift zone. From this work, it is known that water lies 60 m above sea level to the west of the westernmost edge of the rift zone and that water lies at less than 20 m above sea level to the east of this boundary.
Reevaluation of electrical data taken in a previous field season shows that this edge of the rift structure is the westernmost edge of a very low resistivity area. The resistivity values are comparable to those observed in the Puna KGRA and are probably due to rocks saturated with hot, brackish water. The prospects of a moderate-to-high temperature resource appear good in this area.

(5) Keaau

Extensive coverage of this area by electrical and TDEM soundings show that subsurface resistivities are high. The values are compatible with those for rocks saturated with cold seawater. Prospects for a geothermal resource of any temperature are not good.

(6) East Rift of Kilauea

Although this area has been extensively studied in part years and already has been successfully drilled, a few more electrical soundings were obtained to better delineate the lateral and vertical boundaries of the heat resource. After compilation of all electric and hydrologic data on this KGRA, the area can be separated into three areas of geothermal potential. First, the areas north of the northernmost edge of the rift are expected to yield only normal temperature fluids. The area to the south of the rift's southern edge and the area within the rift downrift of HGP-A test well are expected to yield high temperature fluids at depth; fluid temperatures are expected to exceed 200°C at depths less than 1 km below sea level. Finally, the area within the rift, but uprift of HGP-A, may also have high temperature fluids probably at depths greater than 1 km.

VI. Evaluation of VLF and EM Loop-Loop Profiling as Tools for Rapid Geothermal Reconnaissance in Hawaii

Of all the electrical geophysics techniques used thus far in Hawaii, none is both portable enough for one or two men to operate and carry on foot, and powerful enough to measure water-saturated rock resistivities through several tens of meters of dry rock. Yet, such a technique would be invaluable for covering large areas in enough detail to quickly determine where one might concentrate more expensive exploration methods. The method cannot be one involving direct current (DC) principles; experience and theory have shown that such methods require a minimum of three people and electrode spacings of about five or six times the maximum elevation in volcanic terrain. EM methods are more promising. Therefore, to fill this gap, the VLF (Very Low Frequency) and EM loop-loop (EMGUN or SLINGRAM) methods were evaluated theoretically and subsequently tested in selected field areas.

Low frequency EM energy is much more sensitive to low resistivity materials than those having high resistivities. One can show theoretically that EM techniques are almost totally affected by depth to and the resistivity of a low resistivity rock layer when its overburden is a few hundred times more resistive.
Both methods were used in several areas on the islands of Maui and Hawaii with mixed results. The loop-loop technique never worked well at all; readings were generally noisy which precluded quantitative analysis for saturated-rock resistivities. The VLF technique worked the best, yielding fairly reliable estimates of saturated-rock resistivities at elevations up to 50 m. Use of both techniques on Maui were complicated by the interference of low-resistivity ash interbedded with lava flows. VLF should still be useful in the drier terrain of Maui, although the results will have to be interpreted carefully.

VII. Application of Statistical Analysis to the Determination of Geothermal Indicators: Hawaii Groundwater-Chemistry Data

Both univariate and bivariate statistical procedures have been applied to the 388 well water analyses compiled by HGRAP to deduce the combination of well parameters which would best be used to discriminate between waters that are thermally affected and those that are not. Details of three individual aspects of the study are outlined.

(1) Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) of Data Grouped by Temperature

The 388 sets of data were split into two groups based on present water temperature and ANOVA on 45 variables was computed. The 45 variables include 7 physical parameters, 29 chemical parameters, and 9 chemical ratios. We were testing the null hypothesis that "the average value of each of the 45 variables for groundwaters at temperatures above the threshold temperature is equal to the average value of the variables for groundwaters at temperatures less than or equal to the threshold temperature". The following is the list of variables for which the null hypothesis could be rejected at 90% confidence for two values of the threshold temperature:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold = 25°C</th>
<th>Threshold = 30°C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>selenium (Se)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alkalinity</td>
<td>silica (SiO₂)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selenium (Se)</td>
<td>sodium (Na)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silica (SiO₂)</td>
<td>chloride (Cl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zinc (Zn)</td>
<td>potassium (K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lead (Pb)</td>
<td>calcium (Ca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calcium (Ca)</td>
<td>copper (Cu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bicarbonate (HCO₃)</td>
<td>Mg/Cl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copper (Cu)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg/Cl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K/Cl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₄/Cl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na/Cl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca/Cl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na/K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the exception of pH and all the ratios except Na/K, all variables are higher in waters above threshold than in waters below threshold temperatures.
The silica and Mg/Cl relationships had already been suggested on theoretical grounds. Na, Cl, K, and Ca are all major constituents of seawater and their presence in this list is a reflection of the larger amount of seawater observed in most high temperature wells. Cooper and selenium had not been considered before, and may be promising discriminant variables.

This aspect of the study is viewed as successful because it confirms all relationships proposed for thermal discrimination, as well as discovering two new discriminators.

(2) Correlation Coefficient Matrix:

Correlations have been computed for all pairs of the 45 physical, chemical, and ratio variables. The strongest relationships are seen between the major ions in seawater - Na, Cl, SO₄, K, and Mg. Analyses of these coefficients are continuing.

(3) Factor Analysis:

Rotated principal component analysis (R-mode) was performed on the 279 analyses which had non-zero values for the following variables: temperature, HCO₃, SiO₂, Ca, SO₄, Mg, Na, Cl. The three largest factors and their loadings are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>0.940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₄</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiO₂</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>0.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCO₃</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temperature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explained variance</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Loadings less than 0.25 are not shown. The three factors explained 84% of the total variance. Factor 1 is obviously seawater effects, Factor 3 is temperature effects, and Factor 2 is probably return-irrigation-water effects. At the present stage of analysis, departures from the 3-factor model may be more interesting than the factors themselves, as far as geothermal indicators. Factor analysis isolates the major components of variance; however, a geothermal indicator is probably a very small source of variance to the overall set of data.
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ABSTRACT

This paper represents only part of one chapter of a detailed geological, hydrological, geochemical and geophysical investigation of thermal water occurrence, in and adjacent to the Nampa-Caldwell area of southwestern Snake River Plain, Idaho.

Geochemical studies using stable isotopes of hydrogen and oxygen show that thermal water in the Nampa-Caldwell area is depleted by 20 $^\circ$/oo in $\delta^2$D and by about 2.3 $^\circ$/oo in $\delta^{18}$O relative to cold water and indicates the water may be rain or snow water that fell more than 11,000 years ago.

The isotope data may show the effects of considerable mixing of a thermal parent water with an isotopic composition of $\delta^2$D $\sim$150 $^\circ$/oo and a $\delta^{18}$O $\sim$-18 $^\circ$/oo with colder waters from Lake Lowell and canal systems, Snake River water, Reynolds Creek basin or similar elevations, perhaps the Boise and Payette rivers and applied irrigation water.

The geothermal parent water in the Nampa-Caldwell area appears, from isotope data, to be identical to parent geothermal waters in the Bruneau-Grand View and Boise areas of the western Snake River Plain, or to have a similar source(s) and/or age.
STABLE ISOTOPE INVESTIGATION

by

John C. Mitchell

INTRODUCTION

Isotopes are two forms of the same element which differ only in the number of neutrons (uncharged atomic particles) in the nucleus of the atom. This means that different isotopes of the same element will differ only in their relative mass. It is this mass difference that governs their kinetic behavior and allows isotopes to fractionate during the course of certain chemical and physical processes occurring in nature.

The four stable isotopes that have proven most useful in water resource evaluation are hydrogen (^{1}H or H), deuterium (^{2}H or D), oxygen 16 (^{16}O) and oxygen 18 (^{18}O). These isotopes make up 99.9 percent of all water molecules.

Isotopic compositions are reported in "δ" notation in parts per thousand (per mil = 0/oo) relative to Standard Mean Ocean Water (SMOW) as defined by Craig (1961b), where 

\[ \delta_i = \left( \frac{R_i}{R_{std}} - 1 \right) \times 1000 \]

where \( R_i \) equals either \(^{18}O/^{16}O\) or D/H while \( i \) and std represent the sample and standard, respectively.

The result of isotopic fractionation during evaporation of ocean water and subsequent condensation of vapor in clouds is that fresh (meteoric) water is generally depleted in \(^{18}O\) and D (enriched in \(^{16}O\) and H) compared to seawater. The isotopic variations of water in rain, snow, glacier ice, streams, lakes, rivers, and most nonthermal groundwaters are extremely systematic; the higher the latitude or elevation, the lower (more depleted in heavy isotopes) the \( \delta D \) and \( \delta^{18}O \) values of the waters. On the basis of a large number of analyses of meteoric waters collected at different latitudes, Craig (1961b) showed that the \( \delta^{18}O \) and \( \delta D \) values relative to SMOW are linearly related and can be represented by the equation:

\[ \delta D = 8 \delta^{18}O + 10 \]

which is plotted in figure 4-1. Groundwater sampled in an area whose isotopic composition plots on the trend (meteoric water line) are generally considered to be meteoric waters.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample or Well No. (Location)</th>
<th>Measured Surface Temperature (°C)</th>
<th>Measured Water Temperature (°C)</th>
<th>$\delta^18O$ SMOW (‰)</th>
<th>$\delta D$ SMOW (‰)</th>
<th>Cl (mg/l)</th>
<th>F (mg/l)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7N-4W-22aca Payette R., Gem Co.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-14.4</td>
<td>-125</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7N-2E-15daa Payette R., Boise Co.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-14.6</td>
<td>-124</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6N-1W-25bbd1 Willow Cr., Gem Co.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-14.6*</td>
<td>-124</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5N-1E-35acdl Dry Cr., Ada Co.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-16.9*</td>
<td>-143</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5N-1E-36bd1 Dry Cr., Ada Co.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-15.4</td>
<td>-128</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4N-4W-04dcl</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-17.7</td>
<td>-147</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4N-4W-05bbdl</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-17.3</td>
<td>-145</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4N-3W-19acdl Richardson #1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-17.2*</td>
<td>-142*</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3N-2E-10accl Capitol Mall #1, Ada Co.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-17.0</td>
<td>-141</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3N-3W-03bcl</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-15.6</td>
<td>-128</td>
<td>21.</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3N-3W-30dcl1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-16.5</td>
<td>-137</td>
<td>98.</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3N-2W-14dacl1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-17.4</td>
<td>-138</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3N-2W-17bcl1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-16.5</td>
<td>-136</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3N-2W-23bd1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-17.1</td>
<td>-151</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3N-2W-26dd1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-16.6</td>
<td>-135</td>
<td>38.</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3N-2W-31bbcl1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-15.9*</td>
<td>-132</td>
<td>104.</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3N-2W-31dcl1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-16.7</td>
<td>-138</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2N-3W-08dd1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-16.8</td>
<td>-141</td>
<td>24.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2N-3W-22dcl1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-17.4</td>
<td>-143</td>
<td>26.</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2N-3W-22dd1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-17.6</td>
<td>-147</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2N-3W-27bd1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-16.5</td>
<td>-146</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2N-3W-35bacl1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-18.0</td>
<td>-150</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2N-2W-04dcl1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-17.0</td>
<td>-144</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2N-2W-06ab1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-15.9</td>
<td>-131</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2N-2W-16dcl1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-17.1*</td>
<td>-139</td>
<td>16.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2N-2W-16dcl Lake Lowell Inlet</td>
<td>13+</td>
<td>-16.5</td>
<td>-132</td>
<td>21.</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2N-2W-18bb1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-16.1</td>
<td>-138</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2N-2W-34accl1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-16.3</td>
<td>-140*</td>
<td>28.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2N-2W-34dacl1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-17.0</td>
<td>-142*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2N-2W-34dacl1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-17.0</td>
<td>-142</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1N-2W-03ab1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-16.5</td>
<td>-138</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1N-2W-03bb1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-16.5</td>
<td>-138</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1N-2W-08abc1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-16.7</td>
<td>-139</td>
<td>74.</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1N-2W-09bbcl1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-17.0</td>
<td>-141</td>
<td>24.</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1N-2W-09ccl1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-17.0</td>
<td>-142</td>
<td>38.</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1N-2W-17dc1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-16.2</td>
<td>-139</td>
<td>165.</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1S-2W-17abcl1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-17.3</td>
<td>-142</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Average of two analyses or samples.  
+ Average water temperature over one year period from 12 monthly averages.  
- Data not available.  
x Average chloride of 4 analyses each from six wells.
Gat (1971) reported that incongruous results in isotope hydrology studies have generally been interpreted to mean: (1) geographic displacement of groundwaters by flow, (2) recharge from partially evaporated surface waters, (3) recharge under different climatic conditions, (4) mixing with nonmeteoric water bodies—brines, sea-water, connate, metamorphic, or juvenile waters, (5) differential water movements through soils or aquifers which result in fractionation processes (membrane effects), and (6) isotopic exchange or fractionation between water and aquifer materials. Several of these processes tend to be distinctive, either in enriching or depleting the waters in heavier isotopes and can be recognized. Others tend to be similar in results; therefore, interpretations may be ambiguous.

Sampling - Sites for isotope sampling in the Nampa-Caldwell and adjacent areas were chosen on the basis of well log data on file at Idaho Department of Water Resources. Casing records, well depths, lithologies penetrated, measured surface temperature, and structural geology considerations, so far as known, were considered. Landsat images of the western Snake River Plain were studied to locate sample sites on or near lineaments passing through the Nampa-Caldwell area based on the hypotheses that the lineaments might be migration channels through which recharge waters moved into the Nampa-Caldwell area. However, sampling was restricted by lack of proper access ports from which reliable samples could be obtained. Consequently, about half the sample sites were determined by accessibility. Rivers (except the Boise, inadvertently omitted), lakes and canals in and adjacent areas outside the area of study were also sampled. Boise River water should be similar isotopically with Lake Lowell inlet waters as Lake Lowell inlet waters are derived from the Boise River. A total of 40 samples were analyzed by mass spectrometry by Krueger Enterprises, Inc., Geochron Laboratories Division, Cambridge, MA. On the basis of duplicate samples and analyses the data appear to be precise within 1 °/oo for 6D and 0.2 °/oo for 6180. These data are given in Table 4-1 and sample locations are shown on figure 4-2 and figure 4-3 (in pocket). The data are shown plotted as 6D and 6180 in per mil units on figure 4-4.

Observations - From Table 4-1 the range of 6D values for thermal waters (>20°C) sampled in the Nampa-Caldwell area is from -136 to -151 °/oo. The range of 6180 values is from -15.5 to -18.0 °/oo. For cold waters (<20°C) sampled in and around the Nampa-Caldwell area, the range of 6D value is from -123 to -135 °/oo and the 6180 of cold waters ranges from -15.0 to -16.7 °/oo. The thermal waters are therefore depleted by about 20 °/oo in 6D and by about 2.3 °/oo in 6180 relative to cold water from in and around the Nampa-Caldwell area.
As shown by figure 4-1, the Nampa-Caldwell waters are somewhat similar to other geothermal waters in Idaho. They most closely resemble waters studied by Rightmire, Young, and Whitehead (1976) and Young and Lewis (1980) in the Bruneau-Grand View area but are displaced still further to the right of the meteoric water line and exhibit a somewhat greater spread between thermal and nonthermal water. This heavy isotope enrichment for cold waters (displacement to right of meteoric water line) for cold waters is typical of some arid and semiarid localities. The relatively isotopically lighter thermal waters (displaced downslope from cold waters) are, however, distinctive. Figure 4-1 shows that all of the high temperature thermal waters are derived from meteoric waters on their trend line, while the thermal waters from Weiser, Bruneau-Grand View and Nampa-Caldwell areas cannot be derived directly from the plotted nonthermal waters.

Figure 4-4, which is an enlarged version of a portion of figure 4-1, shows that most of the data fall on, or near, one of a group of straight lines that converge to intersect well 2N-3W-27bbal at a δD of -150 °/oo and a δ¹⁸O of -18 °/oo. Most cold waters sampled are observed to plot in the upper right portion of the graph near the upper right extremities of the lines. Exceptions are those samples of thermal waters taken outside the Nampa-Caldwell area, which also plot in this section of the diagram. Most thermal waters plot in the lower left portion of the plotting field.

It should be noted that other straight lines can be drawn through other data points (i.e., line a, and a line from 6N-1W-25bbdl to 4N-3W-19adc1). Other straight line data do not include all data points, do not correlate with temperature data (see below), nor do they have cold waters as one end member and thermal water as the other.

Figures 4-5 and 4-6 are plots of measured surface temperatures of water from wells versus δD and δ¹⁸O, respectively. Several points which do not fall on any of the established converging lines generally are higher temperature water from deeper wells or water from thermal wells sampled outside the Nampa-Caldwell area. Straight line plots are obtained for certain data points which again converge toward the sample from well 2N-3W-27bbal. A comparison of figure 4-4 with figures 4-5 and 4-6 reveals a 63% correlation of data points for line 1. If deep water data are not included, the correlation is 71%. A comparison of figure 4-4 with figures 4-5 and 4-6 for line 2 reveals a 67% correlation between figures 4-4 and 4-6. If deep water data is ignored, the percent correlation is 75%. Table 4-2 summarizes the common data points of lines 1 and 2 for figures 4-4, 4-5 and 4-6. There is little or no correlation for
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### Table 4-2

Correlation of data points for line 1 and 2 between figures 4-4, 4-5, and 4-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Line 1 Data</th>
<th></th>
<th>Line 2 Data</th>
<th></th>
<th>Line 2 Data</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δD vs. δ18O</td>
<td>δD vs. t</td>
<td>δ18O vs. t</td>
<td>δD vs. δ18O</td>
<td>δD vs. t</td>
<td>δ18O vs. t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>figure 4-4</td>
<td>figure 4-5</td>
<td>figure 4-6</td>
<td>figure 4-4</td>
<td>figure 4-5</td>
<td>figure 4-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16dba</td>
<td>16dba</td>
<td>16dba</td>
<td>36daa1</td>
<td>36daa1</td>
<td>36daa1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17bad</td>
<td>17bad</td>
<td>17bad</td>
<td>3bbca1</td>
<td>3bbca1</td>
<td>3bbca1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16daa1</td>
<td>6aba1</td>
<td>6aba1</td>
<td>6aba1</td>
<td>6aba1</td>
<td>6aba1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19adc1**</td>
<td>31bb11</td>
<td>31bb11</td>
<td>31bb11</td>
<td>31bb11</td>
<td>31bb11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17abb1</td>
<td>17abb1</td>
<td>17abb1</td>
<td>26ddbl*</td>
<td>26ddbl</td>
<td>26ddbl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22acd1</td>
<td>30dd11</td>
<td>30dd11</td>
<td>30dd11</td>
<td>30dd11</td>
<td>30dd11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4ddc1***</td>
<td>4ddc1</td>
<td>4ddc1</td>
<td>31dcb1</td>
<td>31dcb1</td>
<td>31dcb1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27bba1*****</td>
<td>27bba1</td>
<td>27bba1</td>
<td>8acb1</td>
<td>8acb1</td>
<td>8acb1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27bba1*****</td>
<td>27bba1</td>
<td>27bba1</td>
<td>8acb1</td>
<td>8acb1</td>
<td>8acb1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27bba1*****</td>
<td>27bba1</td>
<td>27bba1</td>
<td>8acb1</td>
<td>8acb1</td>
<td>8acb1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27bba1*****</td>
<td>27bba1</td>
<td>27bba1</td>
<td>8acb1</td>
<td>8acb1</td>
<td>8acb1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10acc1**</td>
<td>9cccb1</td>
<td>9cccb1</td>
<td>9cccb1</td>
<td>9cccb1</td>
<td>9cccb1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34daa1**</td>
<td>35ccca1</td>
<td>35ccca1</td>
<td>35ccca1</td>
<td>35ccca1</td>
<td>35ccca1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22bdcl****</td>
<td>22bdcl</td>
<td>22bdcl</td>
<td>22bdcl</td>
<td>22bdcl</td>
<td>22bdcl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27bba1*****</td>
<td>27bba1</td>
<td>27bba1</td>
<td>27bba1</td>
<td>27bba1</td>
<td>27bba1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27bba1*****</td>
<td>27bba1</td>
<td>27bba1</td>
<td>27bba1</td>
<td>27bba1</td>
<td>27bba1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Probably analytical or sampling error, see text.

** Thermal water from sources deeper and hotter than the aquifer from within the "blue clay."

*** Conductively cooled (?) water, see text.

**** In this region of the graphs, lines are so close together as to lie within each others "window" of analytical precision. It is difficult to assign a given value to a given line. Sample 22bdcl has been assigned to line 2, as temperature verses δD and δ18O graphs of figures 4-5 and 4-6 indicate that this is a more reasonable location.

***** In making the percent calculation, the sample from well 2N-3W-27bba1 was included in the calculation for both lines 1 and 2 of Table 4-2. The argument can be made that the data is therefore biased in favor of the mixing hypothesis. If the data point from well 2N-3W-27bba1 is not included, the argument can be made that this has biased the data in favor of some other hypothesis. If the data point is not included in the percent correlation of lines 1 and 2 data of Table 4-2, the correlation is still greater than 50 percent with the other reasonable assumptions included. The correlation is considered significant and can only be adequately explained by mixing of thermal and nonthermal waters in various proportions with no conductive cooling. Note line 5 data not included.
line 3 (line 4?) data on figures 4-4, 4-5, and 4-6. Line 5 data appears on figures 4-4 and 4-6 only. On figure 4-5, line 5 data plots on line 2. There is considerable scatter in the data related to lines 3 and 4 of figure 4-4 when compared to line 3 of figures 4-5 and 4-6, and making definite interpretations from this data is difficult. The argument can be made that lines 3 and 4 of figure 4-4 are really one line which would fall between lines 3 and 4. Due to the window of analytical precision, the lines cannot be separated.

Plots of fluoride and chloride versus δD and δ18O were studied in an effort to determine if changes in their concentration were related to the isotopic composition of the water. The figures merely showed that dissolved concentrations of these elements are low in the sampled waters and are not related to the isotopic composition; therefore, the diagrams are not included as part of this report.

Discussion - There are several interpretations or theories which might be applied to explain the above mentioned observations of the data plotted in figures 4-1, 4-4, 4-5 and 4-6. White, Barnes and O'Neil (1973), and Truesdell and Hulston (1980), interpreted data of a similar nature to that of figure 4-4 from the California coast ranges, and Long Valley, California to represent fluid mixtures in various proportions of end member waters. Water from well 2N-3W-27bbal probably represents unmixed geothermal water from the Glens Ferry Formation derived from an aquifer within or below the "blue clay" (see Chapter 3 of this report for a discussion of the "blue clay"). Records for this well show unperforated casing extending from within the "blue clay" layers to the surface. Most other wells in the Nampa-Caldwell area are perforated, either continuously, or in various zones, or have large sections of hole uncased. The drillers logs show that many wells take water from several zones. Well 2N-3W-27bbal water may, therefore, represent one parent water from which most other well waters of the Nampa-Caldwell area are derived. The other parent water(s) may be represented by either Lake Lowell or Snake River water, (line 1) Reynolds, or similar elevations (line 2), or Payette River and/or Willow Creek water (line 3). Data points falling on or near the lines could represent mixtures of the parent waters in various proportions. Well 1S-2W-17abbl, which plots on the Snake River mixing line (line 1), was drilled within a few hundred meters of the Snake River. Well 4N-3W-19adcl (Richardson #1, line 1) may be a mixture of water represented by 2N-3W-27bbal water, Lake Lowell and/or Snake River, or perhaps Boise River water. The temperature depth profile (from Smith, this report, figure 5-10) indicates water from well 4N-3W-19adcl is a mixture from at least three zones. On line 2, well
2N-2W-34bdal may represent water which is a mixture of 2N-3W-27bbal type water with a water represented by well 2S-3W-36daal near Reynolds in Owyhee County, 50 air kilometers due south of Caldwell in the Owyhee Mountains, or similar elevations. The ratio of the length of the line segment connecting data points 2N-3W-27bbal and 2N-2W-34bdal, to the length of the segment connecting 2N-2W-34bdal and 2S-3W-36daal (line 2, figure 4-4) represents the fraction of the hot water end member. These data indicate that a significant proportion of the recharge for the shallow groundwater (above the "blue clay") may come from the aquifer within or below the "blue clay," and also from several other sources, including perhaps Reynolds Creek Basin, or similar elevations, Lake Lowell and the Snake River through applied irrigation, and possibly leakage from Lake Lowell and its canal systems. The direct temperature-isotope dependence for the data points on lines 1 and 2 of figures 4-5 and 4-6 is a result that would be expected if the waters are mixtures of warm and cold water from two sources. In mixing of warm and cold water (no other processes taking place) the resultant temperature of the mixture would depend only on the initial temperatures of the warm and cold waters and their volumes involved in mixing. Isotopic composition of the mixed water would also be proportional to the volumes of end member waters.

The temperature-isotope dependence is not interpreted as being caused by depletion or enrichment due to kinetic responses of the isotopes, but rather to mixing of parent waters of different isotopic compositions; one warm, the other cold, in various proportions, with little conductive cooling, either within aquifers, or within well bores as the result of man-made aquifer unions.

In order for the isotope data to indicate mixing, the data must fit corresponding lines of all three figures, or reasonable assumptions made as to why the data does not plot on corresponding lines.

Various points of figures 4-4, 4-5 and 4-6 do not fall on any lines and this could be due to several processes including isotope exchange reactions with aquifer or permeable zone constituents, further evaporative enrichment or depletion in heavy isotopes from already enriched surface irrigation water as a result of sprinkler and corrugate irrigation practices, seasonal changes in isotopic composition of the recharge water, multiple mixing, conductive and/or convective cooling of mixed waters, or waters from deeper and hotter aquifers with the same or different isotope ratios, or analytical or sampling errors. The high measured surface temperature of water from well 4N-3N-19adcl (Richardson #1) arises because the water ascends rapidly.
An example of conductive or convective cooling might be represented by water from well 4N-4W-4ddcl which plots on line 2 of figure 4-4, but plots 6.5-7°C to the left of line 2 on both figures 4-5 and 4-6. If 6.5°C is added to the temperature of this well, it will also plot on line 2 of both figures 4-5 and 4-6. Perhaps, after mixing, the water cools by 6.5°C by conductive or convective heat transfer as the water flows through the aquifer and up the well bore.

An example of sample or analytical error might be shown by water from well 3N-2W-26ddbl which plots on line 2 of figure 4-5 only. If a δ18O value of -0.3‰ is subtracted from the δ18O value of -16.6‰ reported in the analyses for well 3N-2W-26ddbl, this data will plot on line 2 of figures 4-4, 4-5, and 4-6. The parallelism of line 5 to line 2 of figures 4-4 and 4-6 suggests that a systematic error, either in the sampling or analyses of line 5 data is possible. If -0.9‰ to -1.0‰ is added to the δ18O values found in Table 4-1 this data will plot on line 2, as it does in figure 4-5. The sample from well 3N-2W-23bcdl (line 5) was taken from a 100 meter long, 15 cm diameter discharge pipe only partially full of water. This may have allowed atmospheric gases to mix with the water, or more importantly, allowed some evaporation of thermal water to take place before sample 3N-2W-23bcdl was collected. Steam was seen emerging from the discharge pipe, along with the thermal water. The slight depletion in δD (1‰) over sample 2N-3W-17bdal could be due to Rayleigh type (non-equilibrium) evaporation from sample 3N-2W-23bcdl. This would indicate two wells in the area with parent geothermal water compositions of δD = -150 and δ18O = -18.

Line a of figure 4-4 represents a line of slope 5 which runs through Lake Lowell (16bdal) and Snake River (17bad) data points (Mariner, 1981, personal communication). The fact that several lines of slope 5 can be drawn through the data of figure 4-4 may be indicative of the effects of evaporation to dry air of meteoric water before recharge to the ground water system. This could indicate a pre-evaporation isotopic composition δD = -150‰ and δ18O = -20‰ (Ellis and Mahan, 1977 p. 75). Thermal water of isotopic composition δD = -150‰ and δ18O = -18‰ could be derived from the pre-evaporated water composition by an enrichment of δ18O of 2‰ in the parent thermal water brought about by oxygen isotope exchange of water with aquifer or reservoir minerals. Isotopic exchange is the generally accepted method of explaining the trend line (oxygen shifts) observed in isotopic compositions of water from many of the higher temperature geothermal systems.
Larderello, Geysers, Heckla, Mount Lassen, and Steamboat Springs) of the world (figure 4-1). Pre-evaporation isotopic compositions of Payette River, Boise River, and Snake River water are unknown at present but might be similar to integrated isotopic values of spring water within upper reaches of their drainage basins. River waters, particularly Snake River water, would be modified by many influences during downstream flow and pre-evaporation isotope values might be difficult to obtain. δD isotope values of meteoric waters in recharge areas of the Payette River drainage basin seem to be near -128 to -131 ‰ (Lewis and Young, 1980) and in the Boise River drainage basin may be near -135 to -139 ‰. This would seem to rule out the Payette and Boise rivers as sources of recharge of the geothermal parent water with subsequent 18O enrichment by isotopic exchange, provided the isotopic composition of spring waters in upper reaches of these drainages is indicative of pre-evaporative isotopic composition of the river water. These conclusions are speculative and more data investigating the possibility of recharge to the thermal systems from river waters are needed before the conclusions can be substantiated.

Several other lines, parallel to line a (slope 5) might be drawn through the data on figures 4-4. These lines do not include all data points, do not correlate with temperature data, do not have cold waters as one end member and thermal water as the other, lead to even lower δD values than exist in the thermal waters if interpreted as evaporation lines, and would mean that water from nearly every sampled well has undergone differing amounts of evaporation from five or six unidentifiable sources, a conclusion which seems highly unlikely. These lines are not considered further in this report.

Regarding the origin of the geothermal water, Rightmire, Young and Whitehead (1976) interpret light thermal waters, or displacement downslope for thermal water in the Bruneau-Grandview and Weiser areas, to mean precipitation at higher elevations where climatic conditions are cooler, or precipitation during a period of time when the climate was cooler than that prevailing today. Cooler temperatures at higher elevations will result in depleted isotope values, but these should be reflected in cold water in the sampled area also, unless the cold water is recharged at lower elevations. A time period which was generally cooler than the Holocene (present) geologic Epoch was the Pleistocene Epoch or ice age that ended approximately 7,800 to 11,000 years ago. Young and Lewis (1980) proposed that Bruneau-Grand View area thermal waters might be at least 2,400 to 3,300 years old and could be as much as 8,000 years old, or older, or could have come from elevations of
460 to 825 m higher in elevation than cold springs they sampled. Mayo (1981, personal communication) reported that thermal waters in the Blackfoot Reservoir area of southeastern Idaho have been age dated at 14,000 to 36,000 years old. If Pleistocene precipitation is the source water, then circulation times for recharge of the thermal aquifers may be relatively long (7,800 to 11,000 years or greater if old water is being displaced by new recharge), or there may be relatively little present day recharge for the system. Relatively little present day recharge could mean the waters are being mined.

Water levels in wells in the Bruneau-Grand View area were reported by Young and Whitehead (1973) to have declined, which suggests mining or recharge insufficient for present withdrawal (recharge over long periods). Stevens (1962) noted rising water levels in wells in the Dry Lake area south of Lake Lowell, which he attributed to increased irrigation from surface water. Recently, however, water levels were noted to drop sharply, as much as 15 meters in one year (Norman Svaty, personal communication, 1979). This could reflect additional groundwater pumpage or the drought conditions of 1976, which would indicate recharge times of about 3 years (if drought related), but perhaps only for the aquifers above the "blue clay."

Alternate hypotheses which could explain the isotopically light (depleted) thermal waters in the Nampa-Caldwell area are: (1) exchange of hydrogen and oxygen isotopes between water and other hydrogen and oxygen containing sources within aquifers or permeable zones. Methane gas and some hydrogen sulfide is suspected in some wells in the area and organic debris was accumulated within the sediments as they were deposited. Methane gas, hydrogen sulfide, and organic accumulations could be a source of hydrogen. However, estimated aquifer temperatures do not seem high enough for appreciable exchange to have occurred. (2) Fractionation of isotopes by semipermeable membrane processes in clays may also occur. Sufficient data is not available at present to evaluate this effect. (3) The thermal water may be isotopically lighter because of subsurface boiling and steam separation in deep aquifers with the separated steam phase recondensing and reequilibrating chemically in aquifers above those where steam separation occurs. Again, aquifer temperatures do not appear high enough at shallow depth where boiling could occur, and the isotope data do not show the characteristic oxygen shift of high temperature systems (figure 4-1) unless the evaporated river water hypothesis as a source of the geothermal water is accepted. (4) The trend line could represent a meteoric water line for the Nampa-Caldwell and adjacent areas; however, this does not explain the temperature-isotope ratio relationship (figures
4-5 and 4-6) found in the data, nor does it explain why most cold water plots near one end of the trend line and thermal water plots near the other extremity.

Figure 4-7 is a modified plot of isotope data obtained by Young and Lewis (1980) from the Bruneau-Grand View area in southwest Idaho. Convergence of these data points to a water of the same composition as that of the parent geothermal water in the Nampa-Caldwell area ($\delta^D = -150, \delta^{18}O = -18$) is indicated by the diagram. If the parent water is real in the Bruneau-Grand View area it would indicate (1) considerable mixing of thermal waters in the Bruneau-Grand View area, more so than previously realized, and (2) parent geothermal waters in both areas are from the same source and/or time or the systems are interconnected. Also, isotope ratios from geothermal waters found in Ada County near Boise plot on lines 2 and 4. This could indicate that in the Boise area geothermal waters might be mixtures of geothermal water of near identical isotopic composition with water from well 2N-3W-27bbal and waters of isotopic composition similar to Payette River and/or Reynolds Creek water. However, more data from the Boise area are badly needed to confirm this assumption.

It appears, from the above arguments, that the hypothesis that most easily explains the isotopic data on lines 1 and 2 of figures 4-4 through 4-6 is mixing of thermal water of constant temperature and isotopic composition $\delta^D = -150$ O/oo and $\delta^{18}O = -18$ O/oo with cooler waters of several distinctive isotopic compositions. The origin of line 3 (line 4?), data on figure 4-4, apparently involves thermal water represented by water from 2N-3W-27bbal which may have undergone systematic isotopic changes not presently recognized or completely understood. As no temperature-isotopic ratio correlation is observed for line 3 (line 4?), factors other than mixing may be involved.

The hypothesis that appears to best explain the origin of the thermal waters with available data in both the Nampa-Caldwell and Bruneau-Grand View areas is that of old water originating as precipitation during an extended time interval when climatic conditions were cooler than at present. Alternatively, the thermal water might have originated as evaporated river or lake water with subsequent 18O enrichment through oxygen isotopic exchange with aquifer or permeable zone minerals at temperatures in excess of 100°C very deep (>2 km) within the geothermal system(s). The easiest way to distinguish between the two hypotheses may be through age dating of the geothermal waters using unstable isotope techniques.

Isotope Data and its Relations to Lineaments - Figure 4-2 shows locations of major lineaments in the western Snake
River Plain and isotope sample locations. The linear features were drawn from Landsat false color infrared images obtained from satellite data at 1:1,000,000, 1:500,000 and 1:250,000 scale, enhanced by the EROS Data Center.

Lineament features are noted that cross the Snake River Plain as well as those that nearly parallel the Plain axis as the majority of them do. The lineaments appear as faint cultural features and patterns, and, in the case of the lineaments parallel to the Plain's axis (northwest trending), they are associated with some parts of minor drainages which are parallel to the axis. Outside the culturally disturbed area, several of the lineaments parallel to the Plain's axis coincide with volcanic cones, buttes, and domal structures. Some of the northeast trending lineaments (perpendicular to the Plain's axis) can be traced into the mountain ranges flanking both sides of the Plain. In the culturally disturbed portion of the Plain, the lineaments represent edges of topographic features (hills, valleys, and drainages) which force cultivation patterns that become apparent as linear features. These hills, valleys and drainages are thought, in some cases, to be fault bounded. Because of the huge scale of the features at which ground observations or air photo reconnaissance are made, these patterns are not apparent on the ground or on air photos. The correlation of lineaments parallel to the Plain's axis with volcanic features (L1 and L2, figure 4-2) indicates that some of these lineaments may represent some type of fault, fissure, or perhaps a large scale deep seated joint system. Several correlate well with faults found on reflective seismic data (L3 and L4) and in the shallow well log data (L1 and L4). The fact that several lineaments are seen to cross the Plain and extend into the mountain ranges on either flank indicates that minor recurrent crustal instability may have occurred along the lineament after formation of the major features of the western Snake River Plain. The lineament (L2) corresponds approximately with Stevens (1962 p. 20) groundwater divide. This lineament passes through Powers Butte, Initial Point and Little Joe Butte in southern Ada County. Other volcanic domes, cones, and buttes are found in similar alignment along both sides of this lineament. The lineament could explain the groundwater divide (see Chapter 3, this report). Isotope data (figure 4-4) seem to ignore this divide as data from wells plotting on mixing lines 1, 2, and 3 are found on both sides of the divide. The divide apparently influences the shallow groundwater system and not the deep regional groundwater system (Whitehead, 1981, personal communication).

The warm water isotope data (line 2, figure 4-4) generally are found in wells near the Reynolds Creek-Freestone
Creek lineament (L5, figure 4-2), as might be expected if the lineament represents a migration path for recharge water into the Nampa-Caldwell area. Most cold water samples, except near Reynolds, were taken from wells north of Lake Lowell. The position of the sampled cold water wells form a linear relation parallel to the Plain axis. However, well construction, zones perforated, and aquifers penetrated, may have more bearing on which line of figure 4-4 the isotope data from a particular well plots than does its location with respect to other geologic features.

The isotope data is considered remarkably consistent for an area as large as encompassed by this study and as complex as the water regime in the area appears to be. The isotope data furnish constraints within which interpretations of other geochemical data must lie in order to be considered valid.
CONCLUSIONS

When observed in its entire perspective, and in view of the complicated nature of the Nampa-Caldwell groundwater systems and possible surface water sources mixing with groundwaters, the isotopic data from the Nampa-Caldwell area of southeastern Idaho is consistent in its interrelations to itself and other types of data. This consistency lends credence to the following conclusions.

(1) Geothermal waters are depleted in heavy isotopes which may mean recharge from precipitation in areas of higher elevation (geographic displacement) or during a time when the climate was colder than that prevailing today. If recharge occurred during the Pleistocene Epoch (ice age) the water is equal to or greater than 11,000 years old. Alternatively, depleted water could be the result of evaporation of river water with subsequent $^{18}O$ enrichment, or result from semipermeable membrane clay layer processes.

(2) Recharge may be taking place over a long period of time or, there may be relatively little present day recharge to the thermal system.

(3) Mixing of thermal and nonthermal waters is widespread in the Nampa-Caldwell area occurring within aquifers and well bores due to well construction. The total effects on the geothermal and nonthermal aquifers or permeable zones due to migration and mixing of thermal and nonthermal waters on the longevity of the geothermal aquifers for use as a heat source is not known.

(4) Cold water recharge, for aquifers above the "blue clay," appears, from isotope data, to be from Reynolds Creek basin south of the Snake River Plain or similar elevations, the Snake River, Lake Lowell and canals due to irrigation practices, perhaps the Payette River, Boise River, and Willow Creek areas north of the Snake River Plain.

(5) Temperatures of the aquifer within the "blue clay" appear to be only about 30°C and may be fairly uniform over large areas.

(6) Thermal water of isotopic composition $\delta D = -150$ $^0$/oo and $\delta^{18}O = -18$ $^0$/oo appears to be widespread in the western Snake River Plain region and may be the parent geothermal water in the Nampa-Caldwell
area, the Boise area, and the Bruneau-Grandview area and perhaps other areas. This indicates the water in these areas may be from the same source(s) and/or times of recharge, or the geothermal system may be interconnected.
RECOMMENDATIONS

The isotope data may be interpreted to indicate that thermal waters in the Nampa-Caldwell area, and indeed other areas in Idaho, including Weiser, Bruneau-Grandview and Boise areas may be old waters (11,000 years or greater). It is not known if present withdrawals of old water are being replaced with present day recharge. If not, the thermal waters are being mined and large scale withdrawals, i.e., for space heating or other purposes could eventually deplete the aquifer(s) to a point where further economic use is not feasible. To maximize the longevity of the resource until recharge can be proven or disproven, it is recommended that for space heating or other geothermal purposes, consideration be given to the use of down hole heat exchangers (heat exchangers located within the well bores adjacent to, or within the aquifers). These have proven practical at other localities such as Klamath Falls, Oregon. Down hole heat exchangers have two advantages: (1) they do not deplete the water resource, (2) there is little or no chemical pollution, as little or no geothermal water is brought to the surface.

Investigations of effects of widespread artificial aquifer connections by well drilling on the longevity of the thermal aquifers and their use for a heat source should be conducted.

Investigations to delineate possible recharge of the thermal aquifers should be undertaken to determine if recharge is presently occurring. These could include further stable isotope work in suspected recharge areas in the mountains on both sides of the Snake River Plain, tritium age dating, and dating using $^{12}C$, $^{13}C$, and $^{14}C$ and inert gas methods to determine absolute age of thermal water from various thermal aquifers.

More work is needed to determine clay layer semi-permeable membrane effects on the stable isotope ratios in the Nampa-Caldwell area. This particular study would be in the realm of institutions with adequate research facilities for such studies.

Monitoring of potentiometric surfaces to detect stress effects in the aquifer would provide early warning of water level declines should these take place due to increased pumpage from geothermal development.

Isotope data has proved to be a very valuable tool in this investigation and should be incorporated as standard water quality data in other areal investigations where
deemed appropriate. Isotope studies should be integrated in any groundwater study of the Boise Front Geothermal system.
REFERENCES


Craig, H., 1961a, Isotopic variation in meteoric waters: Science v. 133, p. 1702-03.


FIGURE 4-1. Isotopic composition of thermal and nonthermal waters of the Nampa-Caldwell area, Canyon County, Idaho compared with meteoric waters and waters of selected geothermal systems of Idaho and the world. [Modified from Rightmire, Young and Whitehead (1976) after White, Barnes, and O'Neil (1973).]
FIGURE 4-2. Index map of a portion of southwestern Idaho showing isotope sample locations and major lineaments in the western Snake River Plain and adjacent areas. Lineaments are a composite of independent work of Anderson and of Mitchell (1980).
27ba1 Well number or sample locations

- Cold water (<20°C)
- Warm water (>20°C)
- Average—2 or more analyses or samples

FIGURE 4-4. Isotopic composition of thermal and nonthermal waters from selected wells and surface waters in the Nampa-Caldwell and adjacent areas of Southwest Idaho.
FIGURE 4-5. Measured surface temperatures of selected wells and surface waters versus $\delta$D in the Nampa-Caldwell and adjacent areas of southwestern Idaho.
FIGURE 4-6. Measured surface temperatures of selected wells and surface waters versus δ¹⁸O in the Nampa-Caldwell and adjacent areas of southwestern Idaho.
FIGURE 4-7. Isotopic compositions of thermal and nonthermal waters from selected wells and springs in the Bruneau-Grand View and adjacent areas, Owyhee County, Idaho. Modified from Young and Lewis (1980, p. 19).
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INTRODUCTION

A low-temperature geothermal resource investigation was begun in Kansas in 1979. This paper should be considered a progress report of that investigation, so the results and speculations should be considered preliminary in nature. The individual facets of the study are discussed individually after the outline of the geologic and tectonic framework.

GEOLOGIC AND TECTONIC FRAMEWORK

The Midcontinent portion of North America is the most stable part of the continent, tectonically. The region is relatively aseismic, and there has been no significant deformation of the crust since at least the Late Paleozoic. The major tectonic elements of this region are (1) the southern extension of the Central North American Rift System (Midcontinent Rift; Midcontinent Geophysical Anomaly; Figure 1); (2) the Nemaha Ridge; and (3) the Central Kansas Uplift.

The Central North American Rift System [Ocola and Meyer, 1973; Chase and Gilmer, 1973] can be traced from central Kansas across southeastern Nebraska, Iowa, and Minnesota to its outcrop area in the Great Lakes region. The rift is marked by pronounced gravity and magnetic anomalies [King and Zietz, 1971; Lyons, 1950; Thiel, 1956] and is underlain by mafic igneous rocks, mostly basalt and gabbro, and arkosic sedimentary rocks. The feature is generally regarded as an abortive continental rift which occurred about 1100 m.y. ago [Goldich et al., 1961; Silver and Green, 1963, 1972; Goldich et al., 1966; Chaudhuri and Faure, 1967; Van Schmus, 1971].

The Nemaha Ridge is a striking tectonic feature which was intermittently active during Paleozoic time. It is certainly a major crustal
fracture zone, for mylonitized basement rocks have been brought up from within it, and cataclasis is a common feature along its extent from northeastern Kansas into Oklahoma [Bickford et al., 1981]. The fault zone is upthrown on the western side, forming the feature known as the Nemaha Ridge. The eastern flank of the Nemaha Ridge is bounded by the Humboldt Fault Zone [Steeples et al., 1979]. Earthquakes as large as Modified Mercalli Intensity VII have occurred along the Humboldt Fault Zone in historic time [DuBois and Wilson, 1978].

The Central Kansas Uplift (Figure 1) is a broad region in which basement rocks have been moved upward and which is characterized by fault zones and cataclasis. The feature is evidently coextensive with the Cambridge Arch in Nebraska. Although the Central Kansas Uplift was active during the Paleozoic, little is known about its Precambrian history. A relatively high level of microearthquake activity (more than 20 events per year larger than magnitude 1) occurs along this structural trend [Steeples, 1980].

The crystalline crust in the Midcontinent is buried under about 1000 m of sedimentary rocks and is thus mostly known from studies of numerous drill holes [Muehlberger et al., 1966; Goldrich et al., 1966; Lidiak et al., 1981; Kisvarsanyi, 1980]. The crust in this area is notable for its predominantly granitic composition. Mafic rocks are rare, and metamorphic rocks, though present in many places, are not abundant. A major feature of the crystalline crust in the Midcontinent is its division into a northern terrane, consisting of somewhat deformed and sheared granitic rocks and lesser amounts of metamorphic rocks that occur in northern Missouri, northern Kansas, and Nebraska, and a southern terrane totally dominated by silicic volcanic rocks and associated
epizonal granitic plutons. The southern terrane can be traced from northern Ohio across Indiana, Illinois, southern Missouri, southern Kansas, and Oklahoma into the Texas Panhandle. Geochronological studies [Bickford et al., 1981; Denison et al., 1981] indicate that the northern terrane is generally older, with many rocks yielding ages of 1640 m.y. (U/Pb, zircon) to 1740 m.y. (Rb-Sr), whereas the southern terrane varies in age from about 1475 m.y. in the St. Francois Mountains of southeastern Missouri [Bickford and Mose, 1975] to about 1380 m.y. in southwestern Missouri, southeastern Kansas, and Oklahoma [Bickford and Lewis, 1979; Bickford et al., 1981].

Lying upon the crystalline crust in the Midcontinent region is a section of sedimentary rocks ranging from about 150 m in thickness over parts of the buried Nemaha Ridge to as great as 2 to 3 km thick in basins such as the Hugoton Basin of southwestern Kansas and northwestern Oklahoma. The average thickness of the sedimentary rock section in eastern Kansas where our drilling projects were done is about 1 km. The rocks range in age from Late Cambrian to Pennsylvanian or Permian in eastern Kansas, but there is a thick Cretaceous section in central Kansas, and rocks of Tertiary age occur on the western plains. Paleozoic rocks in the Midcontinent region are mostly marine in origin and are dominated by carbonate units and shale.

PIGGYBACK DRILLING

Normal exploration procedure for most resources involves drilling as a culmination of geologic and geophysical investigations. It would seem that drilling four holes in an area the size of Kansas at the outset of a regional geothermal evaluation is a reverse approach.
However, the drilling was done as a "piggyback" operation at a relatively low cost compared to the total project. The data obtained from the boreholes has enabled us to provide high quality heat-flow data for Kansas and to better evaluate thermal information available from the petroleum drill holes.

THE DRILLING OPPORTUNITY

In 1976 a cooperative program between the U.S. Geological Survey and the Kansas Geological Survey was begun. The purpose of the study was to determine the regional geohydrologic characteristics of the Arbuckle Group to include definition of flow patterns in the Arbuckle and in relation to other overlying units, determination of hydraulic parameters in the various units, and determination of regional chemical quality. Test data procured from oil exploration companies are being analyzed to accomplish this objective.

Additional funding to the Kansas Geological Survey became available in FY 1979 and FY 1980 for the purpose of test drilling and installation of deep monitor wells. This funding was matched and increased by the U.S. Geological Survey, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Kansas Department of Health and Environment; the project was expanded to include determination of hydrologic properties of the Arbuckle and other units by drilling at specific locations.

We were not involved professionally in any aspect of the Arbuckle project when it was originally funded. However, we realized that valuable petrologic and geophysical data could be obtained if these holes could be deepened by about 100 m to penetrate the crystalline basement. Four drilling sites were selected. Three of the four sites were selected
so that, in addition to the hydrologic study, basement rock samples and geophysical data could be obtained from the same holes. Two of the sites were located above intense, circular magnetic anomalies; the third was located in a region where sparse well control indicated a terrane of silicic volcanic rocks in the basement.

We received funding from LASL and the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) to deepen the first two holes, recover core from the basement, and perform high-quality heat flow measurements in the holes. Funding was also received from a separate LASL contract to deepen the third hole; however, severe circulation problems developed within the Arbuckle Formation before the "piggyback" experiment could begin. All of the money from that contract was returned to LASL.

Cost of Drilling Operations

A contract was awarded in September 1979 in the amount of $444,701 for work to be performed at the first three sites. A second contract, in the amount of $129,341 for work to be performed at the fourth site, was awarded in April 1980. Seventeen drill-stem tests were completed for the purpose of determining the hydraulic relationships between the Arbuckle and other major overlying aquifers. Three cores of the Arbuckle were collected in addition to the basement cores, and these are currently being analyzed under a third contract. A complete suite of geophysical logs, including vertical flow determinations, were completed at each site. Also, acoustical televviewer photographs were taken over selected intervals at three sites. Water samples have been collected at three sites and are undergoing complete chemical analyses, including determinations for age dating with lithium, bromine, strontium, deuterium, carbon 14, and tritium.
The increased incremental cost of approximately $9,000 per hole for coring in the Precambrian section of two holes is included in the above figures. Most of the preliminary scientific results reported here are a direct result of this small additional expenditure, thus demonstrating the value of "piggybacking." Less than $30,000 of the total geothermal funding was used for the heat flow studies and the "piggyback" drilling.

SCIENTIFIC RESULTS FROM DRILLING

The author had significant input as to the location of the holes, and their sites were chosen to maximize potential information from the basement, subject only to the general suitability of the location to the primary mission of the drilling project, i.e., the hydrologic study of the Arbuckle. The legal descriptions and locations of holes drilled are given in Table 1.

Drilling at the first hole (Miami County) was completed on December 10, 1979. Approximately 8 m of 6.7-cm-diameter core of fresh granite were recovered from a depth of 658 to 666 m. This hole was located on a sharp 1000-γ circular aeromagnetic high, shown as locality 1 on Figures 1 and 2.

The second hole (Douglas County; locality 2 on Figures 1 and 2) was also located on a circular magnetic high with an amplitude of about 1100-γ; drilling was completed on March 19, 1980. Three meters of 10-cm-diameter core of fresh granite were recovered from a depth of 905 to 908 m. The 3 meters represent only 58 percent recovery of the 5.2 meters cored. We were very fortunate not to lose all of the core, as it started slipping out of the core barrel during the trip up the hole. The core catcher barely hooked the core again and prevented disaster. We were not charged for the core that was lost.
Two additional holes (localities 3 and 4 on Figures 1 and 2) were drilled to depths of 1117 m and 554 m, respectively. Severe lost-circulation problems developed on both of these holes within parts of the Arbuckle Formation, and drilling was halted at that depth because the primary objective of the drilling had been met. Penetration of Precambrian basement at sites 3 and 4 would have cost an additional (possibly very large) undetermined amount of money.

The scientific data we ultimately expect to obtain from the drill core and from the geophysical measurements include the following: age, petrography, major and trace element chemical composition, density, and remanent magnetism of the rocks encountered; heat flow; and heat production of the rock material. The holes into basement can be made suitable for hydrofracturing experiments to measure in situ stress, provided future funding becomes available. The holes will be available to other scientists for other experiments within 2 years. Interested individuals should contact the author of this report.

Some preliminary data are available on age, thermal gradient, and heat flow. The age of the Precambrian cores is about 1350 m.y. (U/Pb of zircons) [Steeples and Bickford, 1981] indicating that the circular magnetic anomalies represent a suite of intrusions younger than the "normal" 1650 m.y. age for the crust in the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 1/4 NW 1/4 NW 1/4 Sec..13, T12S, R17E</td>
<td>908 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labette County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center of SE 1/4 Sec.22, T31S, R20E</td>
<td>553 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 1/4 SW 1/4 SE 1/4 Sec.18, T18S, R23E</td>
<td>666 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saline County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 1/4 SW 1/4 SW 1/4 Sec.32, T13S, R2W</td>
<td>1117 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Geothermal Gradients

Preliminary thermal logging has been performed on all four holes by personnel from David Blackwell's laboratory at Southern Methodist University. The thermal logging equipment was not capable of reaching the bottom of the holes, so these data should be considered preliminary, pending results from deeper logging. Samples of core or well-cuttings have been sent to Blackwell's laboratory for thermal conductivity measurements. The following geothermal gradients have been measured to date in the four holes drilled on this project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Gradient (°C/km)</th>
<th>Depth Logged (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labette County</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami County</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saline County</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preliminary data from Blackwell indicate an unusually high rate of radioactive heat generation, about 11 heat generation units, in the core from the Miami County hole, compared with the 5 to 6 heat generation units for typical granites. The heat generation from the core obtained from the Douglas County hole was not anomalously high.

High quality heat flow measurements have been made in the four drill holes [Blackwell et al., 1981]. The average heat flow in the holes was $54 \pm 5$ milliwatts/square meter ($1.5 \pm 0.1$ heat flow units). These heat flow values are typical for areas of stable Precambrian-aged crust. Additional results will be available after the holes are logged to total depth.
OTHER STUDIES IN PROGRESS

The aeromagnetic map of Kansas (Figure 2) was funded in part with geothermal money. A preliminary interpretation of that map has been published by Yarger (1981). Gravity data are being gathered to supplement the interpretation of the aeromagnetic map. A gravity map contoured at one milligal intervals will be available for the eastern half of Kansas by mid-1982.

We are continuing to measure geothermal gradients statewide and will complete that phase of the field work in time to publish a geothermal gradient map in 1982. Preliminary indications are that geothermal gradients state wide are consistently in the range of 30 to 35°C/km.

Geothermal Speculations for Kansas

Figure 3 shows structural contours on the Precambrian surface relative to sea level. There are areas on this map that bear discussion with respect to low grade geothermal prospects. They will be discussed in counter-clockwise order around Kansas starting with the southeast corner of the state.

1. In the southeastern portion of the state, dip is toward the northwest away from the Ozark Uplift. Sedimentary cover is roughly 500 meters thick with relatively good quality water in much of the sedimentary section. The Arbuckle group of early Ordovician age is used as a fresh water source by several towns. The water temperature is in the range of 25° to 35°C, warm enough to be used for heat pump applications for space heating. This area is the most likely portion of Kansas to have any geothermal applications in the next 5 to 10 years. The geothermal gradient below depths of 500 meters is quite low - possibly in the range of 15 to 20°C/km.

2. The Nemaha Ridge is a buried granitic mountain range that reaches to within 200 meters of the surface in northeastern Kansas. Geothermal gradients in the sedimentary section exceed 50°C/km, but geothermal prospects are poor because the sedimentary section is so thin. The high geothermal gradient is not thought to persist below the bottom of the sediments.
3. To the west of the Nemaha Ridge is the Midcontinent Geo-
physical Anomaly (Figure 1). In Figure 3 the MGA is more
or less bounded on the southeastern flank by six kimberlite
intrusions of Cretaceous age. The northwest flank of the
MGA is bounded by a zone of microearthquakes that have occurred
since 1978. These boundary features along opposite sides of
the MGA indicate structural zones that may allow circulation
and convection of water deep into the crust.

The MGA itself is caused by mafic intrusive and extrusive
rocks of late Precambrian age as discussed earlier. Sur-
rounding the MGA is an arkosic Precambrian age sandstone
(Rice Formation) that developed during the later stages of
rifting and subsidence. The thickness of the Rice Formation
is unknown, but probably substantial. Modeling of the gravity
and magnetics by Yarger (1981) indicates that the edges of the
Rice Formation are probably fault-bounded. It is possible
that the Rice Formation is several kilometers thick, based
on differential arrival times at two seismograph stations in
the vicinity of the MGA.

A deep seismic reflection profile experiment is being per-
formed across the MGA by the Consortium for Continental
Reflection Profiling (COCORP) during 1981. The results of
this experiment will probably allow calculation of the thick-
ness of the Rice Formation.

If there are, indeed, several kilometers of Rice Formation present,
geothermal prospects for production of large volumes of warm
water would be excellent. The quality of any such water is
unknown.

4. The Central Kansas Uplift (Figure 1) is much the same as the
Nemaha Ridge from a geothermal standpoint. However, thousands
of oil wells produce water at temperatures of about 40 to 45°C
in conjunction with oil production. The heat from this water
is not purposefully extracted prior to reinjection in salt
water disposal wells. Other than this by-product warm water,
the geothermal prospects are not good.

5. In northwestern Kansas, the Dakota Formation may be locally
useful for heat-pump applications. Will Gosnold (1981 personal
communication) has discovered that the Dakota waters in western
 Nebraska are unusually warm, apparently as a result of con-
vection updip to the east from the Denver-Julesburg Basin. It
is not yet clear whether this same effect is present in Kansas,
but it will be investigated in the near future.

6. In southwestern and south-central Kansas, the sedimentary
section is 2 to 3 km thick. Waters produced in conjunction
with petroleum are at temperatures of 60 to 65°C. Water qual-
ity is generally poor and the prospects for geothermal develop-
ment are not bright because of sparse population density and
lack of industry in the area.
FIGURE CAPTIONS

FIGURE 1. Principal positive structural features in Kansas. Major basins include the Forest City Basin in northeast Kansas, the Cherokee Basin in southeast Kansas, the Salina Basin in north-central Kansas, and the Hugoton embayment of the Anadarko Basin in southwestern Kansas. Drill sites for heat flow measurements are shown chronologically by numbers 1, 2, 3, and 4.

FIGURE 2. Aeromagnetic map of Kansas. Contour interval is 50 gammas. Drill sites from Figure 1 are shown as 1, 2, 3, and 4.

FIGURE 3. Precambrian structural contours of Kansas with 1000 foot contour interval relative to sea level. Stars in northeast Kansas denote kimberlite locations. Faults and microearthquakes show locations where crustal fractures are present.
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Abstract -- A list of persons and groups doing geothermal research in Montana is presented. A revised list of springs and wells with their flow and temperature values is shown with the heat value, in billions of British Thermal Units (Btu's) per year, for reference temperatures related to low temperature uses. The Boulder and Hunters springs are the foremost hot spring resources, while the Madison Limestone related springs around the Little Rocky Mountains, and Brooks spring north of Lewistown provide the major low temperature resources capable of large development utilizing heat pump technology. The water chemistry of almost all springs is suitable for direct application. A discussion of drilling activities around spring sites and the relative success (or lack thereof) provides some factors to consider. In an attempt to delineate areas with ground-water temperatures suitable for heat pump use, a 10°C (50°F) temperature cutoff was used. Urban area data is suspect; inadequate pumping time may yield spuriously warm temperatures.

The purpose of this paper is to summarize the work done to date, and to report on some recent results relating to Montana's geothermal resources.

Interest in surface occurrences of thermal water as something other than scientific or "medical" curiosity did not become prominent until the early 1970's when predictions of energy shortfalls began appearing. In Montana, previous work consisted of cataloguing by G. A. Waring (23), and "while passing through" studies by S. L. Groff (results summarized in 3); also, Balster (2) compiled a map using bottom-hole temperatures in the Madison Group.

Recent research was initiated by the U.S. Geological Survey in the early seventies from their Menlo park regional office. The formation of first the U.S. Energy Research and Development Agency (ERDA) and then the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) broadened the federal research base and provided funding for state and private research projects. The following list includes most of the Montana-based groups performing geothermal research (either in resource assessment or in engineering applications):


2. Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, Division of Renewable Energy, Helena, Montana: Michael Chapman--user assistance and grants.
Energy Resources: Sonderegger and Schmidt

3. Montana University System
   a. University of Montana, Missoula: Tony Quamar--resource evaluation
   b. Montana State University, Bozeman: Robert Chadwick--resource evaluation
   c. Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology, Butte: John Sonderegger and Charles Wideman--resource evaluation

4. Fort Peck Tribal Research Program, Poplar, Montana:
   Carl Fourstar--resource definition and application (near Poplar)

5. Montana Energy Research and Development Institute,
   Butte, Montana: Karen Barclay--resource definition and application (Warm Springs State Hospital)

THERMAL SPRINGS

Because warm and hot springs represent an expression of a geothermal system at depth, an inventory of such springs has traditionally been the first step in evaluating the resource potential. One of the problems recognized in the mid 1970's was that adequate measurements of spring discharge and temperature were not always available (at a given temperature, the energy available is directly proportional to the spring discharge) normally because of poor discharge numbers which often varied by as much as 400 percent. In the fall of 1975, Robert Leonard was assigned to the USGS Montana district; after reviewing the Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology (MBMG) spring data files, Leonard decided to restrict his work to occurrences of waters hotter than 100°F in the southwestern portion of the state. Later, the MBMG instituted a statewide study of low temperature occurrences partially funded by ERDA and DOE.

Figure 1 is a histogram of thermal spring temperatures in Montana. The large block of springs representing temperatures of 30°C or less is, in the majority of cases, related to springs issuing from the Madison Group. Most geologic parameters tend toward normal or lognormal distribution. Ground-water temperatures appear to have a lognormal distribution; in Montana, the average ground-water temperature is between 7 and 9°C depending upon the area of the state under discussion. Figure 2 is an approximation of the type of distribution one would expect for thermal spring temperatures; from Figure 2 we infer that the data presented in Figure 1 are grossly biased, i.e., that we have only included those springs with temperatures of less than 25°C which have high discharges. If the temperature of a spring is greater than 25°C, it is usually safe to assume (in western Montana) that even in the summer a body of ponded spring water loses more heat than it gains. At temperatures less than 25°C and low spring discharge quantities (less than 50 gpm), it is possible for solar and biological factors to increase the measured temperature enough to cause a spuriously anomalous spring temperature.
TEMPERATURE OF SPRINGS IN 2°C INCREMENTS; FIRST BLOCK IS 15-16°C.

FIGURE 1. HISTOGRAM DEPICTING THE FREQUENCY OF THERMAL SPRING TEMPERATURES.

TEMPERATURE OF SPRINGS, °C.

FIGURE 2. EXPECTED LOG-NORMAL DISTRIBUTION OF SPRING TEMPERATURES.
Also, our investigations into mine-water drainage, which is usually of fairly shallow origin, showed that the smaller the discharge value the greater the annual variation in water temperature (14). The smallest discharge reported in the MBMG spring data list for springs in the 15 to 20°C range is 130 gallons per minute, and only two of the springs have discharges of less than 1000 gpm (4). By comparison, only two of the seven springs with temperatures of 65°C or greater have discharges greater than 100 gpm (Hunters Hot Springs and Boulder Hot Springs).

Obviously, we have erred on the side of being conservative in our past work. However, Table 1 (condensed and updated from references 4 and 21; the former includes location information and some water quality data) shows that when available heat energy is calculated to bottom-use temperatures of 25, 18, and 10°C, only the high discharge/low temperature springs constitute a significant resource. An alternate way of viewing these data is with respect to heat pump usage. For a domestic dwelling of 2500 square feet, the generally available heat pumps now being produced would require 10 to 15 gpm of 15°C water for typical Montana winter weather conditions. Thus, a 15°C spring with a proven 150 gpm yield could only heat ten domestic dwellings. By comparison, even without the use of a heat pump, 150 gpm of 60°C water will heat 60 to 75 domestic dwellings using modern design practices. It is for these practical reasons that only large volume springs were initially emphasized in our studies.

Figure 3 depicts the locations of the springs listed in Table 1. Most of these springs are in western Montana, with the largest concentration in southwestern Montana. At present, there are no known instances of magmatic heating of these thermal waters (6). Dates on the age of igneous rocks in Montana range from very ancient to 0.11 million years before present (9). Known rocks younger than 2.0 million years are very few, extrusive, and of very limited extent in western Montana; consequently, they are not believed to represent a significant thermal resource. The known geothermal systems in eastern Montana are believed to result solely from deep circulation of meteoric ground water with fracture control of spring locations (21).

The best summary to date of all available water chemistry is by Leonard et al (15) from 24 springs and 3 wells, which is essentially for the southwestern portion of the state. By the time this article appears, the MBMG will have published a preliminary map of the geothermal resources of Montana, which will include the most representative chemical data for at least 70 springs and wells. Also, an annotated bibliography of geothermal studies in Montana, current through January of 1980, has just been published (20), and NOAA has published a thermal spring list for the United States (5).

Geophysical studies at hot spring sites have been conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey and the three units of the University System listed previously. All of these results have emphasized the importance of faults and fractures controlling the
Table 1. Heat value of water from selected springs and flowing wells.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Temp. (°C)</th>
<th>Flow (gpm)</th>
<th>H₁ (25°C) (10⁹ Btu/yr)</th>
<th>H₂ (18°C) (10⁹ Btu/yr)</th>
<th>H₃ (10°C) (10⁹ Btu/yr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPRINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaconda</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andersons</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>8.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andersons Pasture</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apex</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avon</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Creek</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bearmouth</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaverhead Rock</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Joint</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridger Canyon</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadwater</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>72000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>5630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browns</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camas</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter Bridge¹</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Lodge Prison</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durfee Creek</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkhorn</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ennis</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>8.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallogly</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100(?)</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrison</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>'80*</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregson</td>
<td>(Fairmont)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greyson</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunsaker²</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunters</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinpton²</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Duke</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landusky</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3100</td>
<td></td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landusky Plunge</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Warm</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodgepole</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lolo</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovells</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMenomoney Ranch</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Biltmore</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26*</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>8.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Temp. (°C)</td>
<td>Flow (gpm)</td>
<td>H₁ (25°C) (10⁹ Btu/yr)</td>
<td>H₂ (18°C) (10⁹ Btu/yr)</td>
<td>H₃ (10°C) (10⁹ Btu/yr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimrod</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norris</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipestone</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plunkets</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potosi,3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pullers</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renova</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Star</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleeping Child</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>330(?)</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloan Cow Camp</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staudenmeyer</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun River</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targhee Sulfur2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toston</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trudau</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigilante</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.S. State Hosp.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Fork S.H.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Sulphur3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>400*</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf Creek</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WELLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Temp. (°C)</th>
<th>Flow (gpm)</th>
<th>H₁ (25°C) (10⁹ Btu/yr)</th>
<th>H₂ (18°C) (10⁹ Btu/yr)</th>
<th>H₃ (10°C) (10⁹ Btu/yr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camp Aquã</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>330*</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colstrip</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringling</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>240*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Sulphur-duq</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Average temperature with mixing factors deleted.
2. Added after Figure 1 was drafted.
3. Replaced by well.
4. Cemented and abandoned.
The Ennis hot spring has the highest surface temperature (83°C) of all springs in the state, and has been the object of detailed study by the USGS and the Montana Tech Geophysics Department. At the Ennis (Thexton) hot spring, gravity, seismic, telluric, and audio-magnetotelluric investigations have shown that block faults parallel and nearly normal to the valley trend have controlled the discharge point of the thermal system (8, 17, 18). Studies at other sites such as: (1) Warm Springs State Hospital (12); (2) Silver Star (1, 16); (3) Norris and Hunters hot springs (7); and the Little Bitterroot Valley (Camas area, work in progress, 10, 13) show structural factors as having a significant effect on the location of the thermal system discharge point(s).

WARM AND HOT WELLS

Thermal wells can be divided into two basic categories: (1) those wells drilled with the express intention of obtaining hot water or hot dry rock; and (2) wells drilled for hydrocarbons or water which incidentally encountered hot water. The boundary between these two classes is sometimes vague, representing water wells drilled near a hot spring with the hope that hot water might be encountered.

Wells have been drilled expressly for geothermal purposes at the Bozeman, Broadwater, Ennis, Fairmont, Warm Spring State
Hospital, and White Sulphur Springs hot spring areas and at the Marysville heat flow anomaly. Results to date have not been highly encouraging. The best results have occurred at the Broadwater hot spring where Frank Gruber is reported to have obtained about 350 gpm of water at approximately the spring temperature, 62°C or 144°F (R. B. Leonard, pers. comm.). The results and duration of pump testing at Broadwater have not been made public, so we have no way of evaluating whether this system will provide a sustained yield at the tested discharge rate and temperature.

At White Sulphur Springs, Dave Grove has promoted the development and utilization of geothermal energy. The first attempt was to drill a deep well to heat the new bank building. The well was drilled in 1978 to a depth of 875 feet. Temperature logging of this well showed that the hottest zone encountered was between depths of 100 to 200 feet; the pump test data provided a calculated transmissibility of 103,000 gallons per day per foot of drawdown (gpd/ft) and an estimated safe yield of 50 gpm of 118°F (48°C) on a continuous use basis (D. E. Dunn, pers. comm.). The second project was to improve the spring area by cleaning it out and installing a cement culvert (equivalent to the procedure used for dug and bored wells). This system is reported to be producing 350 gpm of 136°F (58°C) water (Lloyd Donovan, pers. comm.). The latter approach is an excellent example of successful inexpensive development; previously reported temperatures for the spring range from 95 to 125°F, with the "best" value being 115°F. It appears that in the process of improving the spring, shallow ground water mixing was reduced, producing the higher temperature.

Other spring operators have not been as fortunate. At Fairmont (Gregson) hot springs, several wells were drilled in an attempt to increase the amount of hot water available. All of these wells produced cold water. Experience at the Bozeman hot spring has been mixed. The present "spring" is actually a shallow well adjacent to the spring discharge point. A recent attempt to obtain more hot water resulted in a well which could not be held open and which did not produce enough water to warrant installing a pump; reworking of this well has improved its yield.

The Marysville "hot dry rock" well was drilled because of very high heat flow values in that area. Unfortunately, the 6790 foot deep well encountered water bearing zones with a maximum temperature of 204°F (96°C) (19).

By comparison, the 540 foot well drilled last summer at Ennis, while originally scheduled as a test well, had smaller diameter pipe used for heat flow testing. The well hit bedrock at approximately 540 feet and had a bottom hole temperature of 95°C (203°F). With the bottom open it was flowing 2.5 gpm with a surface temperature of 93°C (199°F) (R. B. Leonard, pers. comm.). At present there is an obstruction in the well and attempts to fish it out have so far been unsuccessful.
At Warm Springs State Hospital, a 1498 foot production/test well was drilled in the fall of 1979. The driller's pump broke down during development, so no pump testing was conducted. At the time the pump failed, it was reported that the discharge was about 140 gpm, with 975+ feet of drawdown, which yields a maximum transmissibility coefficient (T) of 200 gpd/ft. A flange, pressure gauge, and additional valve were recently installed by the shopmen at the hospital. We conducted a short, 65 minute, shut-in test on 9 April 1980 which proved inter-connection between the well and spring, and provided T values of 34 gpd/ft before the spring responded and 70 gpd/ft after spring flow started increasing. The shut-in pressure at the end of the test was 138 pounds per square inch (psi). Based upon the data available, we estimate that the well has a maximum safe yield of 70 gpm of 78 to 80°C water. The difference in T values between the development work following drilling and the shut-in test may be because slotted casing was used instead of well screen and there may be some very large well losses. The Montana Energy Research and Development Institute has scheduled additional development and testing for this well and it is hoped that the well performance can be improved.

In the category of wells which incidentally encountered hot water, the best documented case is the Western Energy well at Colstrip. The well was drilled to a depth of 9200 feet; the majority of the hot water is believed to have come from the Mission Canyon Limestone at a depth of 7700 feet. Well tests by Van Voast yielded a transmissibility of 650 gpd/ft, and a storage coefficient of 2 x 10^{-4}; under test conditions, the well flowed 230 gpm of 207°F (97°C) water with a 16 psi confining pressure. A petroleum laboratory analysis of the water yielded a total dissolved solids content of about 1500 milligrams per liter. The pH value reported was 6.3, which is not very acidic; but, the water was sufficiently corrosive to cause casing leaks in a period of about five years. The well has since been cemented and abandoned.

Old petroleum test wells that produce warm or hot water frequently produce this water from the Madison Group. The Ringling and Lucas wells near White Sulphur Springs produce 800 and 100 gpm of 48°C (118°F) and 42°C (108°F) water from Mississippian age rocks (15). The Saco well, now used by the Sleeping Buffalo Resort produces a reported 290 gpm of 49°C (106°F) water from this same strata.

A recent study by P.R.C. Toups, Inc. for the Fort Peck Indian Reservation has proven a valuable resource is available in the water separated from the crude oil produced on the Poplar Dome. Also, they suspect that hot water may be available at relatively shallow depths north and east of Poplar along the trace of the Brockton-Froid fault zone (22).

HEAT PUMP APPLICATION

The present heat pump technology calls for "heavy duty" pumps and compressors in order to utilize typical Montana ground
water in the temperature range of 42 to 47°F (6 to 8°C). Figure 4 shows six areas which appear to have ground-water temperatures above 10°C, and many be suitable for use with normal heat pump systems. A word of caution is needed with respect to these data. Temperature is one of the most easily altered characteristics of ground water due to failure to pump a well long enough for all aspects of the delivery system to come to thermal equilibrium, either due to the problem of disposing of the water or low well yield. Most inventory work is done during the summer months, which commonly means that any error in the temperature measurements validity will be biased towards a higher temperature.

Favorable areas B, C and D are in suburban areas of Missoula, Helena, and Billings, where problems of water disposal are greater. The reported "warm" temperatures for these areas contribute a smaller percentage of the total number of temperatures in these areas, and may be related to failure to achieve thermal equilibrium. The water is almost entirely from shallow (< 300 feet deep) wells and may show considerable seasonal variation. In these three areas, it is recommended that the water temperature be measured during the winter season after the well has been pumped steadily for at least two hours. If the temperature and yield are satisfactory under these conditions, the well should be permitted to recover and a three-day continuous pumping recording the water level in the well should be conducted to ensure an adequate yield. Most people in the field believe that a sustained yield of 20 gpm is required (11).
Other areas depicted on Figure 4 have greater certainty of the temperature data. The Little Bitterroot Valley (area A) has an extensive gravel aquifer in the valley fill sediments. Temperatures of well water produced from this zone generally range from 10 to 51°C. The area is still under investigation by Joe Donovan and a final report will be issued by MBMG in 1981.

Area E, northeast of Pryor, is tentative at this time. A drilling report for one water well indicates that wells drilled into the Kootenai Formation should be abnormally warm in this area.

Area F is provisional at present, being based upon the temperature from one well. The Bureau recently drilled a 400 foot municipal test well outside of Florence. Flow testing of this well was brief (120 minutes at 10 gallons per minute); however, the well produced water at a temperature of 64°F (17.3°C). Even if increased production from this zone lowered the temperature because of pumping-induced vertical movement of cooler water from above, the production temperatures should still be adequate for heat pump use.

Area G, just off the Poplar Dome, is the site of ground temperature surveys conducted by Joe Birman of Geothermal Surveys Inc. Temperatures were measured at a depth of ten feet below land surface and temperatures greater than 10°C (50 F) were encountered along several linear trends (22). Bedrock is the Bearpaw Shale in this area and it may be necessary to drill fairly deep to obtain sufficient water for heat pump use. The investigators hope to find a secondary zone of hot water at a depth of roughly 500 feet, just below the Bearpaw Shale.

SUMMARY

Good data are available for most of the thermal springs in Montana. The quality of data for thermal wells varies greatly and part of our current effort is to improve this data base. Data presented show heat content for various reference temperatures related to low temperature use. Drilling results are variable in the vicinity of hot springs; development of the springs is recommended prior to drilling. Heat pump utilization will increase, with the greatest potential being in the Little Bitterroot Valley.
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Addendum

The first issue of Geothermics for 1981 (v. 10, no. 1) arrived after submission of this manuscript. This issue includes an article entitled "Sodium/Lithium Ratio in Water Applied to Geothermometry of Geothermal Reservoirs" by Christian Fouillac and Gil Michard (p. 55-70). They present the following two empirical equations for reservoir temperature calculation:

1. \[ \log_{10}(m_{Na}/m_{Li}) = \frac{1000}{T} - 0.38 \] for \( Cl^- < 0.2M \), and
2. \[ \log_{10}(m_{Li}) = \frac{-2258}{T} + 1.44 \] for \( Cl^- < 0.2M \);

the reader is referred to Fouillac and Michard for details on the deviation of the equations.

Using these equations with the Camp Aqua well data results in the highest calculated reservoir temperatures. Equation (1) yields a reservoir temperature of 49°C, slightly below the observed temperature at the wellhead. Equation (2) yields a reservoir temperature of 83°C, slightly greater than our source temperature using the chalcedony curve on the \( SiO_2 \) - Enthalpy plot (figure 6). While these calculations are subject to the concerns about dilution and ion-exchange processes, these data provide additional support for use of the chalcedony curve on \( SiO_2 \) - Enthalpy plots for low-temperature geothermal systems.
Geophysical Investigations of Certain Montana Geothermal Areas

Charles J. Wideman, Lester Dye, James Halvorson, and Mark McRae

Selected hot springs areas of Montana have been investigated by a variety of geophysical techniques. Resistivity, gravity, seismic, and magnetic methods have been applied during investigations near the hot springs. Because the geology is extremely varied at the locations of the investigations, several geophysical techniques have usually been applied at each site.

Figure 1, an illustration of the generalized geology of Montana, is used to illustrate the extreme complexity of the geology of the study areas. As can be seen from the figure, southwestern Montana is a region of Basin and Range type features superimposed on a mosaic of Batholiths, volcanics, and other features. Northwest Montana is an area of thrust faulting and folding, followed by normal faulting; the normal faults frequently control the orientation and width of the valleys. Along the southern boundary of the state, in the Yellowstone region, the geologic framework is complex, with areas of faulting, folding, and relatively young volcanics.

From the geologic background shown in Figure 1, several hot springs areas have been chosen for investigation. The locations of some of the hot springs are shown in Figure 2. Special emphasis has been placed on the West Yellowstone area for this report because of the unique method of interpretation of gravity data for this area. The interpretation will be discussed in detail later. Table I is a listing of the hot springs which have been investigated by Montana Tech researchers using geophysical techniques. Comparison of Figures 1 and 2 shows that most
of the areas studied have been along valley margins in the southwestern portion of the state.

The West Yellowstone research area is unique in terms of geologic setting. It is also unique in that it is immediately adjacent to a National Park. The study area, a region approximately six miles by nine miles in extent, is northwest of the town of West Yellowstone, Montana. In this area, there is geologic evidence of folding, thrust faulting, rhyolite flows, and modern day block faulting caused by uplift and extension. The results of a gravity survey of the area have been combined with gravity data obtained from the Geophysical Data Base maintained by N.O.A.A. in Boulder, Colorado. The combined gravity data were used to obtain a Bouguer Anomaly map which is shown in Figure 3. The geologic complexity of the area is reflected in the Bouguer map, and variations of several milligals over short distances are common.

Interpretation of the gravity map has been facilitated by making use of theoretical work done by Yeatts (1973). His work predicts the displacements expected near faults of various attitudes and displacements and, in particular, his map showing expected vertical displacements near a thrust fault with 15 degree dip is illustrated in Figure 4. The pattern of displacements shows remarkable similarity to the portion of the gravity map near Horse Butte, located in the northwest portion of the survey. Therefore, the Horse Butte area is interpreted to be an expression of thrust faulting. The area is suspected of having topographic features at the time of thrust faulting closely resembling those predicted by the map of Yeatts. Inspection of Figure 4 shows that the paleo-surface associated with thrust faulting should have regions of relative low elevations behind the fault. In addition, there should be
a region at the sides of the fault which are predicted to be broad lows. Immediately in front of the fault, downwarping occur as on the over-ridden side; but further to the front a moderate high is predicted. The region of relatively high elevations occurs because of folding in front of the thrust fault. Areas which were topographically low have since been filled by rhyolite flows and other material derived from the surrounding high areas. Areas of modern day faulting tend to occur where the fill material undergoes thickness variations. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that gravitation analysis has been aided by the use of predictions based upon dislocation theory. For the case presented here, the analysis seems to have facilitated the gravity interpretation of an extremely complex area.

Reference Cited
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Name</th>
<th>Investigation Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centennial Valley</td>
<td>Gravity, Magnetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Lodge Valley</td>
<td>Resistivity, Gravity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena Valley</td>
<td>Gravity, Seismic, Resistivity, Magnetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Springs–Camp Aqua</td>
<td>Gravity, Seismic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregson (Fairmont) Hot Springs</td>
<td>Gravity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipestone Hot Springs</td>
<td>Resistivity, Gravity, Seismic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Star (Barkells Hot Springs)</td>
<td>Resistivity, Gravity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ennis (Thexton Hot Springs)</td>
<td>Seismic, Gravity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm Springs</td>
<td>Gravity, Resistivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Yellowstone</td>
<td>Gravity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Locations of hot springs and hot wells.
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GEOTHERMAL INVESTIGATIONS IN NEBRASKA: METHODS AND RESULTS

William D. Gosnold, Jr.
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GEOTHERMAL INVESTIGATIONS IN NEBRASKA: METHODS AND RESULTS

Introduction.

At the inception of the geothermal resource assessment program in Nebraska there was some skepticism about the existence of any geothermal resources within the state. Now after two years of study and collaboration with other workers in the geothermal field we find that about two-thirds of the state has access to a potential low-temperature resource. The nature of the resource is warm water in laterally extensive aquifers which are overlain by thick (> 1 km) sections of low thermal conductivity sediments. For most of the resource area the high temperatures in the aquifers result from high temperature gradients in the overlying shales. However, in the northcentral and far western parts of the state there is evidence for convective heat flow due to updip water flow in the aquifers. The success of the program has resulted from the synthesis of heat flow and temperature gradient measurements with stratigraphic and lithologic data. This paper describes the methods used and the results obtained during the study.

Methodology.

The general plan of the resource assessment has been to acquire heat flow and subsurface temperature data and to synthesize these data with other geological information. Heat flow sites (Figure 1) were selected on the basis of our interpretation of existing data on the thermal regime of Nebraska. The published literature are summarized by Gosnold (1980 a) and are reproduced here for reference (Figure 2). In addition to published literature...
data from temperature logs made in a number of water table observation wells (Figure 1) were also used in the selection of heat flow sites. Thirteen of the heat flow sites are located in areas indicated as having anomalous subsurface temperatures by the AAPG-USGS geothermal gradient map of North America (AAPG-USGS, 1976). Seven sites are on or near the Nemaha Ridge and ten sites are on or near the Chadron-Cambridge Arch. Three sites also include an area suspected of having anomalous subsurface temperatures by inference from a geothermal gradient map of South Dakota (Schoon and McGregor, 1974).

The geological setting of Nebraska is that of a stable continental platform. The relatively flat-lying sedimentary veneer ranges in thickness from about 300 m in the northeast to greater than 3000 m in the west, and the stratigraphy is relatively well known (Condra and Reed, 1959). The known structural features cannot cause widespread convective heat transfer, thus conductive heat flow is considered to be the primary factor in the thermal structure of the upper crust beneath Nebraska.

In a conductive regime subsurface temperatures are determined by the heat flow and the thermal conductivities of the lithologic units present. Thus knowledge of the heat flow, stratigraphy, and thermal conductivities allows calculation of subsurface temperatures and provides a means for estimating the geothermal resource potential. The general scheme is shown in Figure 3 where heat flow determinations at two sites are used to estimate subsurface temperatures in the regions between and below the sites. The practice of projecting temperature gradients beyond measured depths is theoretically valid in conductive regimes if the thermal conductivities of the stratigraphic section are known. Nevertheless it is best to verify temperature gradient projections.
with equilibrium temperature measurements in deep wells. An essential component of our investigation is the measurement of deep-well temperature gradients especially those near populated regions where the geothermal resource may be exploited.

Projection of a potential geothermal resource by this method requires using the heat flow, thermal conductivity, and stratigraphic data to produce a subsurface temperature map. Then the temperature contours are superimposed on structure contours of the aquifers, and those regions which satisfy the criteria for a low-temperature resource are defined by the intersecting contour lines.

Results.

A total of 28 wells were completed for heat flow and temperatures were recorded to the nearest 0.01 K at 5 m intervals with a thermistor probe. Bulk conductivities of drill cuttings from nine of the wells were measured at the Southern Methodist University Geothermal Laboratory, and porous rock conductivities were calculated using the method of Sass et al., (1971a). The remainder of the drill cutting samples are being processed for measurement later. Estimates of thermal conductivities in the remaining wells were made on the basis of lithology and known conductivities to allow preliminary heat flow calculations (Table 1) for the resource assessment. Some of the preliminary heat flow values have been reduced from previous estimates (Gosnold, 1980a, 1980b) to conform with new data on the thermal conductivity of shales in the Midcontinent (Blackwell et al., 1981).

Heat flow values for most of the state range from 38 mWm$^{-2}$ to 67 mWm$^{-2}$ and fall within expected values for a stable platform with only conductive heat flow. However large areas of anomalously high heat flow appear to exist
in the north central section and in the panhandle west of the Chadron-
Cambridge Arch. These high heat flow areas are interpreted to be due to
convective heat flow within deep aquifers. Two separate convective systems
are postulated to account for the heat flow anomalies.

One system underlies the north central part of Nebraska and the south
central part of South Dakota. The warm water in this system may enter the
Dakota Group through a subcrop connection with the Madison aquifer in South
Dakota and flow within the Dakota Group through the high heat flow zone.
Warm waters are known in numerous wells penetrating the Madison and the Dakota
in South Dakota (Schoon and McGregor, 1974) and 12 water wells in Boyd County
Nebraska produce warm water from the Dakota Group (Souders, 1976). A flowing
well at Lynch Nebraska produces water at 28°C at about 570 l min⁻¹ and was
formerly used to fill the city swimming pool. Temperature gradients and heat
flow increase from east to west in the high heat flow zone suggesting that the
source area for the warm water may lie to the west.

A separate convective system is postulated to account for the high heat
flow west of the Chadron-Cambridge Arch. Figure 4 is a structure contour map
on top of the Dakota from Volk (1972) and shows a configuration that could
cause an extensive, convective heat flow anomaly between the arch and the
Denver-Julesburg Basin. Structural cross sections (Figures 5 a & b ) in
western Nebraska from Condra, Reed, and Scherer (1950) indicate that sub-
surface temperatures should be high due to great thicknesses of low-conductivity
shales. The coupled effect of the thick shale units and updip water flow
probably account for the subsurface temperature patterns in the area (Figures
6 a, b, & c). The results of a finite-difference heat flow model are shown
in Figure 6 d. An updip flow of water in the Dakota at a rate of 1 m yr⁻¹
gives heat flow and subsurface temperature profiles that are consistent with
the existing data. The results of the heat flow data do not contradict the predictions of high heat flow by Swanberg and Morgan (1979), in fact the results provide an explanation for the silica geothermometry anomaly.

Both zones which show evidence of convective heat flow will be included in our scheme of projecting subsurface temperatures on the basis of a conductive heat flow model. We can do this because the convecting zones are the aquifers underlying the Cretaceous shales and we see no problem with projecting temperature gradients down to the tops of the aquifers.

The data have been synthesized to produce a temperature contour map for a depth of 1 km (Figure 7). This map is our first attempt to define geothermal resources in Nebraska, and it does delineate regions which overlie potential low temperature thermal waters. A future version of the map will have structure contours for the warm-water-bearing aquifers and temperature contours for the aquifers. We believe that the second version will clearly delineate potential resource areas by showing three pieces of information, i.e., the locality of the resource, the depth to the resource, and the temperature of the resource. We suggest that this approach is a significant improvement over recent attempts to represent geothermal resources in the Midcontinent.

Examples of comparisons between shallow-well temperature gradients and bottom hole temperature data are shown in Figures 8 & 9. The broad scatter in the BHT data is a ubiquitous phenomenon and casts doubt on the usefulness of those data. However, as a large data set, the BHT data are useful for identifying areas which may have anomalous temperatures.

**Concluding Remarks.**

In a stable continental interior the synthesis of heat flow data with stratigraphic, and thermal conductivity data is highly effective in exploring for low temperature geothermal resources on a regional scale. An effective
method of presentation of the resource in map form is to delineate the resource area with shading, indicate the depth to the resource with contour lines, and indicate the temperature of the resource with another set of contour lines.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality Name</th>
<th>Latitude North</th>
<th>Longitude West</th>
<th>Gradient (K km⁻¹)</th>
<th>Depth Interval (m)</th>
<th>Conductivity (W m⁻¹ K⁻¹)</th>
<th>Rock Type</th>
<th>Heat Flow (mW m⁻²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bennet</td>
<td>40° 38.4'</td>
<td>96° 30.8'</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10-150</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Ls</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Creek</td>
<td>40° 15.9'</td>
<td>96° 11.0'</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>200-200</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>40° 3.0'</td>
<td>96° 27.5'</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>120-145</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Ls+Sh</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella</td>
<td>40° 11.2'</td>
<td>95° 50.0'</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60-80</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Ls+Sh</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Rock</td>
<td>40° 9.1'</td>
<td>96° 4.6'</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>140-155</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Gr</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union North</td>
<td>40° 51.4'</td>
<td>95° 68.9'</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>120-125</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Ls</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union South</td>
<td>40° 46.2'</td>
<td>95° 59.6'</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>75-80</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Ls</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>41° 29.5'</td>
<td>96° 33.4'</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60-115</td>
<td>4.2*</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>41° 49.5'</td>
<td>96° 27.3'</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75-140</td>
<td>4.2*</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Neill</td>
<td>42° 26.2'</td>
<td>96° 39.0'</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>105-150</td>
<td>1.1*</td>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>42° 13.8'</td>
<td>97° 2.5'</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65-115</td>
<td>1.1*</td>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naper</td>
<td>42° 58.8'</td>
<td>99° 1.4'</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10-155</td>
<td>1.1*</td>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springview</td>
<td>42° 57.8'</td>
<td>99° 42.4'</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>10-145</td>
<td>1.1*</td>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentine</td>
<td>42° 54.1'</td>
<td>100° 30.3'</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>25-150</td>
<td>2.2*</td>
<td>Sa+Si</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Elder Canyon</td>
<td>40° 57.6'</td>
<td>100° 34.4'</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45-225</td>
<td>2.2*</td>
<td>Sa+Si</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gothenburg</td>
<td>40° 47.2'</td>
<td>100° 20.5'</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10-235</td>
<td>2.2*</td>
<td>Sa+Si</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Ranch</td>
<td>41° 36.4'</td>
<td>101° 68.2'</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>200-570</td>
<td>1.1*</td>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotwell Ranch</td>
<td>41° 46.7'</td>
<td>101° 40.9'</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>270-570</td>
<td>1.1*</td>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milldale Ranch</td>
<td>41° 39.7'</td>
<td>101° 28.7'</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>240-470</td>
<td>1.1*</td>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>42° 54.9'</td>
<td>102° 12.3'</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10-185</td>
<td>1.7*</td>
<td>Si+Cl</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushville</td>
<td>42° 36.7'</td>
<td>102° 12.3'</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>120-200</td>
<td>1.7*</td>
<td>Si+Cl</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Clay</td>
<td>42° 47.4'</td>
<td>102° 39.4'</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10-35</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Si+Cl</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay Springs</td>
<td>42° 34.2'</td>
<td>102° 38.9'</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10-235</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Si+Cl</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitney</td>
<td>42° 45.3'</td>
<td>103° 16.4'</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>10-153</td>
<td>1.7*</td>
<td>Si+Cl</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayard</td>
<td>41° 49.7'</td>
<td>103° 17.0'</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90-153</td>
<td>2.2*</td>
<td>Sa+Si</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisco</td>
<td>41° 25.1'</td>
<td>102° 33.5'</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10-189</td>
<td>2.2*</td>
<td>Sa+Si</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney</td>
<td>41° 8.2'</td>
<td>102° 56.1'</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20-180</td>
<td>2.2*</td>
<td>Sa+Si</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Springs</td>
<td>41° 4.2'</td>
<td>102° 5.9'</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10-135</td>
<td>2.2*</td>
<td>Sa+Si</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Preliminary heat flow data in Nebraska. Estimated conductivities are indicated by (*). Rock type key: Ls = limestone, Do = dolomite, Sh = shale, Ss = sandstone, Sa = sand, Si = silt, Cl = clay, Gr = granite.
Figure 1. Locations of heat flow sites and other wells where temperature gradients have been measured.
Figure 3. Temperature profile in a conductive thermal regime. Isotherms are contoured on the basis of known heat flow, stratigraphy, and thermal conductivity. The section is typical of western Nebraska where the potential resource is warm water in the sandstone aquifers of the Cretaceous Dakota Group.
Figure 4. Structure contour map of the Dakota group from Volk, (1972). Datum is sea level.
Figure 5. Structural cross sections in western Nebraska from Condra, Reed, and Scherer (1950).
Figure 6a. Hand contours of temperatures recorded at a depth of 150 m.

Figure 6b. Hand contours of temperatures recorded at a depth of 500 m.

Figure 6c. Hand contours of temperatures recorded at a depth of 1000 m.

Figure 6d. Hand contours of temperatures at a depth of 1000 m predicted by a finite difference model of heat flow with updip convection at 1 m yr\(^{-1}\) in the Dakota Group.
Figure 7. Temperature contours at a depth of 1 km as inferred from a synthesis of heat flow data with stratigraphic and thermal conductivity data. The dots are heat flow sites.
Figure 8. Comparison between the temperature gradient in a heat flow hole and bottom hole temperatures in Deuel County.
Introduction

During the past year the Nevada Resource Assessment Team has been working in three areas of Nevada: the first is a potential industrial heat application site - Golconda; the second area has potential for space heating - Hawthorne; and the third area has applications for space heating at a Naval Air Station - Fallon. Several exploration techniques have been employed during the term of the present contract including: chemical analyses of fluids, hydrogen and oxygen stable light isotope analyses, low sun-angle photography interpretation, micro-gravity surveys, two-meter temperature probe surveys, LANDSAT imagery analysis, and geologic reconnaissance.

Several of these techniques are discussed and the positive and negative aspects are addressed as they pertain to particular areas of investigation. The areas of investigation are shown in Figure 1.

Golconda

The Golconda study area is located in north-central Nevada and encompasses 1800 square kilometers. The study area is typical of the Basin and Range province of the western United States, characterized by a broad north-trending valley bounded by mountain ranges.
FIGURE 1. AREAS OF INVESTIGATION.
Figure 2 shows variations in the chemical compositions of thermal and non-thermal fluids within the study area. Thermal fluids tend to be richer in sodium-barcarbonate than non-thermal fluids. The difference in chemical composition is further exemplified in Figure 3, which indicates that the non-thermal fluids have a wide range in composition while the thermal fluids plot in two discrete fields. The large compositional variations for the non-thermal fluids is due in part to the effects of the local geologic environment.

Variations in temperature and the major cation and anion constituents for three hot springs and one thermal well for the past 35 years are shown in Figure 4. The more complete data sets indicate that within average analytical error the thermal fluids do not change drastically for the major cation and anion constituents. The minor variations which occur may be due to the different laboratories that provided the analyses rather than absolute chemical variations.

Trace element analyses of both thermal and non-thermal waters from the Golconda study area (fig. 5) indicate that lithium and barium are better indicators of thermal fluids than strontium or boron. The dashed lines in this figure represent non-thermal fluids. Analysis No. 2 (second from the left in each diagram) has a measured temperature of $13^\circ$C yet has trace element concentrations very similar to thermal fluids, in fact, this concentration of boron for this sample is higher than several of the thermal fluids.

The results of stable light isotope analyses of 18 samples
Figure 2. Chemical variations in fluids sampled throughout the Paradise Valley study area.
Figure 3. Chemical characteristics of thermal and non-thermal fluids in the Paradise Valley study area.
Figure 4. Chemical composition of selected thermal fluids in the Golconda study area, 1945-1980.
of both thermal and non-thermal fluids are presented in Figure 6. The non-thermal fluids are, in general, distinct from the thermal fluids. One exception is the well at Dutch Flat (A, in fig. 6), the same sample that displayed trace element compositions similar to thermal fluids. The similar isotopic characteristics may indicate that these fluids were at one time heated and have been cooled by conduction during transport.

Low sun-angle photography was flown over the Golconda study area to aid in the detection of subtle surface faulting. Several faults were mapped along the west side of the Hot Spring Mountains as a result of interpretation of this photography (fig. 7). Three sites selected for drilling 130 m (400 ft) test wells are also shown. All three holes encountered valley fill alluvium to total depth.

Figure 8 is a temperature gradient profile of well No. 3. A maximum temperature of 19°C was recorded at 130 m and the calculated maximum gradient is 40°C/100 m.

Hawthorne

The Hawthorne study area is located at the south end of Walker Lake in west-central Nevada. There are no surface manifestations of geothermal activity within 30 km of the town of Hawthorne; however, shallow to intermediate depth wells (100-150 m) have temperatures ranging from 24-37°C. A year ago the El Capitan Hotel and Casino drilled a well to irrigate a planned golf course, the well encountered water with a temperature of 96°C at 550 feet. The hole was completed to a T.D. of 750 feet.
FIGURE 5. TRACE ELEMENT ANALYSES OF THERMAL (SOLID) AND NON-THERMAL (DASHED) FLUIDS IN THE GOLOGONDA STUDY AREA.
FIGURE 6. STABLE LIGHT ISOTOPE ANALYSES OF 18 SAMPLES.
Figure 7. Linear and curvilinear features interpreted from low sun-angle photography in the Paradise Valley study area.
FIGURE 8. TEMPERATURE GRADIENT PROFILE OF GDS-3.
and when pump tested it flowed 94°C water at 800 GPM for eight days.

A two-meter temperature probe survey was performed in the Hawthorne study area. Figure 9 shows the results of 96 two-meter probe locations. Normally, hole spacing was on the order of .25 miles in the area of this figure while a one mile spacing was used on a regional basis. In the southern portion of the figure the maximum temperatures recorded were 25°C, the location of the El Capitan well. A north-trending isotherm closure of 24°C can be noted west of the town of Hawthorne. This trend corresponds to trends noted in the low sun-angle photography as well as several gravity highs which were apparent from a micro-gravity survey performed in the area.

Figure 10 shows the equilibrium time for the two-meter probes at Golconda. Twenty-four hours after the hole is drilled the probes are in equilibrium and temperatures can be recorded that reflect the true soil temperature.

Chemical analyses of both thermal and non-thermal fluids indicate that thermal fluids tend to be richer in Na+K and SO₄₂⁻ Cl than non-thermal waters (fig. 11). However, several non-thermal fluids NAD 7, samples 3 and 5 have compositions within the range of thermal fluids. It should be pointed out that the first sample was not analyzed as part of this program and may represent laboratory error. This is also apparent for NAD 8 which had a temperature of 26.5°C but was also not analyzed as part of this study.

Figure 12 represents data obtained from 15 analyses of hydrogen and oxygen stable light isotopes. The analysis with the
Figure 9. Possible isotherm configuration at a depth of 2 meters.
FIGURE 10.
TWO-METER DEPTH TEMPERATURE PROBE EQUILIBRIUM CURVES

TIME IN HOURS
Figure 11. Chemical characteristics of thermal and non-thermal fluids in the Hawthorne study area.
FIGURE 12. STABLE LIGHT ISOTOPIC COMPOSITION OF HAWTHORNE AREA WATERS.
large oxygen shift when compared to the meteoric water line (analysis No. 3) is not due to water-rock interaction but rather to a cracked sample bottle which allowed contamination by atmospheric oxygen. The overall variation between thermal and non-thermal fluids is not great and is even less when analytical error limits are considered. Surface water samples tend to be shifted toward the meteoric water line. Isotopic analyses did not prove useful in the Hawthorne study area.

The photograph of the Hawthorne area (fig. 13) shows the location of a 265 meter hydrologic test hole. The siting of this hole was based mainly on the interpretation of gravity data, low sun-angle photography and two-meter depth temperature probe surveys. Soil mercury and chemical data provided more regional information but did not provide significant contribution to test hole siting. The location is approximately 1.5 miles north of the El Capitan well.

Temperatures recorded in the test hole exceeded 90°C. The hole was blind cased with 3" black pipe. It is anticipated that temperatures similar to those recorded in the El Capitan well will be maintained if the test well is produced. The temperature gradient profile shown in Figure 14 indicates the hottest zone to be between 480 and 580 feet which corresponds to the alluvium bedrock contact. It appears that the thermal fluids rise by convection along the range bounding fault and migrate laterally down the hydrologic gradient to the east.

The Army Ammunition Plant on whose land the well was drilled is submitting proposals to Headquarters requesting funding to
FIGURE 13. LOW SUN-ANGLE PHOTOGRAPH OF THE HAWTHORNE AREA SHOWING THE LOCATION OF THE 235 METER TEST WELL.
FIGURE 14. TEMPERATURE GRADIENT PROFILE OF THE HAWTHORNE TEST WELL.
develop this resource for space heating of the base.

Fallon

The Resource Assessment Team was requested by the Department of Energy (DOE) to evaluate the geothermal resource for the Navy at the Fallon Naval Air Station. Several areas of potential high temperature resources surround the study area on the east (Salt Wells), northeast (Stillwater), northwest (Soda Lake), and to the south (Lee Hot Springs). No surface thermal manifestations exist in the immediate study area which includes 180 square miles.

Soil mercury analyses showed better correlation with major structures in the Fallon area than similar surveys in Golconda and Hawthorne (fig. 15). The mercury anomalies have trends with northwest and northeast orientations. Several soil samples had Hg concentrations in excess of 3000 ppb. The northwest trends probably are related to the Walker Lane structures while the northeast trends indicate an affiliation with the Carson Lineament and Midas Trench systems.

Similar orientations are apparent in the next figure which shows faults mapped from low sun-angle photography (fig. 16). Temperature gradient data from nine wells on the Fallon Naval Air Station range from $13^\circ C/100$ m in the north to $42^\circ C/100$ m at the southern boundary of the Naval Reservation. Well depths ranged from 380 to 505 feet. The higher temperature gradients appear to be associated with structures south of the Naval Air Station and it is our recommendation that the optimum site for a geothermal well for space heating should be located near the southern boundary of the Reservation.
Figure 15. Soil mercury anomalies.
Figure 16. Faults (dashed where inferred).
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ABSTRACT

It has been proposed that forced convection, driven by normal groundwater flow through the interconnected basins of the Rio Grande rift is the primary source mechanism for the numerous geothermal anomalies along the rift. A test of this concept using an analytical model indicates that significant forced convection must occur in the basins even if permeabilities are as low as 50-200 millidarcies at a depth of 2 km. Where groundwater flow is constricted at the discharge areas of the basins forced convection can locally increase the gradient to a level where free convection also occurs, generating surface heat flow anomalies 5-15 times background. A compilation of groundwater data for the rift basins shows a strong correlation between constrictions in groundwater flow and hot springs and geothermal anomalies, giving strong circumstantial support to the convection model.

INTRODUCTION

Harder et al. (1980) and Morgan and Daggett (1981) have presented evidence indicating that the primary source mechanism for the numerous geothermal anomalies along the Rio Grande rift, excluding the Jemez Mountains, is forced convection driven by inter and intrabasin groundwater flow. This deduction has important implications for geothermal development, as it implies a rapid decrease in geothermal gradient with depth in the anomalies, and no potential for electricity generation, if 3 km (10,000 ft) and 200 °C (392°F) are taken as the economic cut-off values for maximum depth and minimum temperature respectively. The geothermal systems may have great potential, however, for direct heat utilization, and future electricity generation with binary, lower temperature systems. It is important, therefore to test as fully as possible the groundwater convection hypothesis to guide geothermal planning and exploration in the rift basins. In this paper we present both a theoretical and practical test of the groundwater convection model.

THEORETICAL TEST OF FORCED CONVECTION HYPOTHESIS

Whenever mass is transferred across a temperature difference, heat is also transferred by convection. In permeable strata of the earth, therefore, any component of groundwater flow parallel to the temperature gradient will convect heat. If the flow is caused by thermally induced buoyancy in the groundwater, the heat transfer is termed free convection. Where flow is driven by an externally derived hydraulic gradient, forced convection is said to occur. Analyses of free convection (e.g. Donaldson, 1962) indicate that a high thermal gradient must be present across the convecting region to drive free convection. It is therefore a secondary enhancement rather than a primary source of a geothermal anomaly. Harder et al. (1980) argue that variations in rock properties or magmatic intrusions are unlikely to cause the numerous geothermal anomalies and hence drive free convection in the Rio Grande rift. Forced convection must occur with the regional north to south flow of groundwater through the rift basins. The only question is whether or not forced convection is a sufficiently efficient heat transfer mechanism to explain the observed anomalies.

To model forced convection it is first necessary to determine the groundwater flow field. Unfortunately although it is technically feasible using numerical methods, there is insufficient permeability information from any of the rift basins, especially for the deeper portions of the basins, to produce a detailed flow model. We have therefore approached the problem in reverse, using an analytical solution to determine at what level of permeability forced convection becomes significant.

We have used the analytical solution for forced groundwater convection in a basin given by Domenico and Palciauskas (1973). These workers derived an approximation to the temperature perturbation caused by groundwater flow in a two dimensional rectangular basin, with groundwater flow along the length L of the basin driven by a hydraulic gradient along the basin derived from a sloping water table, which conforms to the equation \( A - B \cos(\pi x/L) \), where \( A \) is the mean water table elevation, \( B \) is the total drop in water table elevation along the basin, and \( x \) is distance along the basin. Permeability is expressed as hydraulic conductivity \( K \), and is assumed to be constant down to a depth \( D \) in the basin, below which the formations are impermeable. Steady state conditions are assumed to apply. If
Ts is the ground surface temperature, G the undisturbed temperature gradient, a is a mixed thermal diffusivity (thermal conductivity of the saturated rock divided by the product of the groundwater density and specific heat), Domenico and Palciauskas (1973) give the temperature T(x,z) at a point (x,z) in the basin and surface temperature gradient Gs(x) at distance x along the basin as:

\[
T(x,z) = Ts + \frac{G(z - D)}{2a} \left[ \cos(\pi x/L) + \frac{(D - z) \cosh(\pi D/L)}{\cosh(\pi D/L)} \right],
\]

and

\[
Gs(x) = \frac{G}{2} \left[ 1 + \frac{\tanh(\pi (z - D)/L)}{\cosh(\pi D/L)} \right].
\]

It should be noted that the approximations used in the derivations of these equations become invalid as the magnitudes of the temperature or gradient perturbations approach the undisturbed values. The equations are accurate and sensitive, however, to the flow, and hence permeability threshold at which forced convection becomes significant.

For models of forced convection in the Rio Grande rift basins, a depth of 2 km to basement has been assumed, which data presented by Seager and Morgan (1979) indicate is a conservative estimate. A hydraulic gradient of .001 has been used, based on the slope of the Rio Grande between Socorro and Las Cruces. Two basin lengths have been tested, 20 and 100 km, both with ground surface temperatures of 20°C and undisturbed gradients of 40°C/km. The results of these models are shown in Figures 1 and 2. For the 100 km basin model significant convection occurs with hydraulic conductivities of the order of 1 to 2 x 10^-7 cm/s (100 to 200 millidarcies). For the 20 km basin model convection is effective with hydraulic conductivities of 5 X 10^-8 cm/s (50 millidarcies) or less. These hydraulic conductivities are down in the semipervious permeability domain of silt, stratified clay and oil rocks (Bear, 1972, p. 136) and are very realistic for a depth of 2 km in rift basins.

Are the results of the simple analytic models applicable to the complex groundwater flow systems in the Rio Grande rift basins? In detail, the answer is obviously no; local flows will be controlled by low permeability aquifers. Deep recharge and discharge will probably occur primarily in areas with relatively high vertical permeability and/or locally high hydraulic gradients. On a regional basis, however, the models are applicable, as by Darcy's Law, deep flow depends only on the hydraulic gradient transmitted to depth, and is independent of shallow flow conditions. We conclude, therefore, that forced groundwater convection is easily capable of causing major gradient anomalies along the rift, and is the most geologically and physically realistic primary source for the anomalies within the rift.

MODIFICATIONS OF REGIONAL FORCED CONVECTION

Although the general features of the forced...
convection models presented above are believed to be applicable to the Rio Grande rift basins, the features of local anomalies will be strongly controlled by local permeability and hydraulic gradient conditions. In particular, a study of the basins' hydrologies (see below) indicates that discharge from one basin to the next generally occurs through relatively shallow and narrow groundwater constrictions. These constrictions focus the flow upward and laterally, and increase the surface gradients above the levels predicted by the two-dimensional flow models. In addition, the discharge areas are commonly associated with faulting which increases permeability, especially in the deeper semipermeable rocks. Additional permeability may be created by solution by the flowing groundwater, a mechanism that would be particularly effective where pre-basin fill limestones are block faulted upward between basins. Without detailed structural and permeability information it is impossible to test rigorously these hypotheses. They indicate, however, that the numerous diverse geothermal anomalies along the rift could all be caused by the same basic forced groundwater convection mechanism.

The only published detailed subsurface temperature information in the rift is from the Las Alturas anomaly near Las Cruces, New Mexico (Morgan et al., 1979), and these data indicate a temperature inversion in part of the anomaly (Figure 3). This inversion is not predicted by the forced convection model. An inversion is predicted by free convection models when the Rayleigh number (or gradient) is greater than two and a half times the critical Rayleigh number (or gradient) (Donaldson, 1962), as shown in Figure 4. We believe, therefore, that free convection occurs in the Las Alturas system, driven by regional forced convection. This effect is predicted to occur where forced convection increases the gradient to values in excess of 150 to 200°C/km and where the permeability is low (cf. Kilty et al., 1979). Many of the rift anomalies may reflect mixed convection systems.

PRACTICAL TEST OF FORCED CONVECTION HYPOTHESIS

The acid test for any model is whether or not it explains observed data. To test the convection hypothesis we have compiled hydrology data from the rift basins to locate constrictions in groundwater flow where water discharges from one basin to the next. The convection model predicts that these are the areas where geothermal anomalies should occur. The groundwater constrictions are shown in Figure 5, and show a very strong correlation with geothermal anomalies and hot springs, as listed in Table 1. The exact location of each geothermal system depends on the local plumbing of the system, but the strong general correlation between groundwater flow constrictions and geothermal anomalies indicates that the primary source of the anomalies is forced convection.

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

There can be little doubt that many, if not all of the geothermal anomalies along the Rio Grande rift, excluding the Jemez Mountains, are primarily the result of forced convection by inter and intrabasin groundwater flow. In some anomalies forced convection creates high enough gradients for free convection to occur also, creating mixed convection systems. The temperatures within these systems are limited by the maximum depth of water circulation, and the regional geothermal gradient. These conditions are unlikely to produce high enough temperatures at shallow enough depths for electricity generation under current economic conditions. The geothermal systems have great potential for direct heat applications, however.

Although the forced convection models have been developed for Rio Grande rift basins, where
similar permeability and hydraulic gradient conditions exist, either in or out of basins, in other areas, the models should be generally applicable. In particular, the models may explain many of geothermal anomalies throughout the Basin and Range province of the western U.S. A preliminary test on the geothermal anomalies in the Basin and Range of southwestern New Mexico indicates that the models are applicable to this area. We conclude, therefore, that many, if not the majority, of geothermal anomalies in the western U.S. are caused by forced groundwater convection.
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Table 1. Geothermal features and their source basins along the Rio Grande rift. Constriction numbers refer to Figure 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constriction</th>
<th>Source Basin</th>
<th>Geothermal Feature and Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>San Luis</td>
<td>Ojo Caliente, Hot Baths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>San Luis</td>
<td>Rio Grande Gorge hot springs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Española</td>
<td>Embudo constriction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Albu-Belen</td>
<td>None reported, White Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>La Jencia</td>
<td>Canyon, La Bajada constriction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>San Agustin</td>
<td>Possibly feeds hot springs on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>San Marcial</td>
<td>south and southwest of Gila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Engle</td>
<td>area, with additional forced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jornada</td>
<td>convective before discharge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Palomas</td>
<td>San Diego Mt., KGRA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jornada</td>
<td>Radium Springs, KGRA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tularosa</td>
<td>Hueco Tanks, West Texas geotherm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mesilla</td>
<td>Anthony area, Anomalous low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>electrical conductivity zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>currently under investigation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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GEOTHERMAL EXPLORATION METHODS USED
IN THE CAPITAL DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
Margaret R. Sneeringer
Dunn Geoscience Corporation

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Saline and carbonated saline waters occur in the Capital District of New York, most notably in the Saratoga Springs vicinity. The springs at Saratoga are not thermal, their temperatures being generally the same or slightly cooler than normal ground water; but they do have an unusual chemistry with up to 20,000 ppm total solids and large volumes of carbon dioxide. There are fresh water thermal springs occurring in nearby Lebanon Springs, New York, and in Williamstown, Massachusetts. The presence of these thermal springs and the unusual chemistry of the Saratoga waters have led to exploration of a possible geothermal system in the Capital District area. The program is funded by the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (ERDA) and the U.S. Department of Energy.

1.2 The presence of a convective geothermal system in the Capital District area is suggested indirectly from geochemical data and more directly from thermal gradient measurements. Exploration techniques have included: detailed water chemistry; a silica-water temperature survey; free and dissolved gas analysis; a passive seismic survey; a small scale gravity survey coupled with recalculation of existing data; and, a thermal gradient measurement program. The thermal gradient measurement program has produced the most direct evidence of subsurface heat. The temperature data are supported by the geochemical and gravity data, showing a coincidence of the apparent thermal area, the locations of saline and carbonated wells, and locations of possibly related gravity structures. A brief account of the methods used, and the results and value of the techniques will herein be presented.

One of the greatest difficulties in attempting to evaluate this area is that it is culturally highly developed. Large areas are unavailable for geochemical sampling or gradient measurements.
because city water supply systems have replaced the need for private wells, and many of the existing wells have long since been buried, filled in, or simply forgotten. Geophysical work also suffers from the high cultural activity of the area. In particular, it was extremely difficult to locate the microseismic network stations where they would not be affected by pumping stations, heavy truck traffic, quarrying operations, and microwave or other frequency transmission towers. The cultural factor will also affect upcoming work, as the area of primary interest for drilling is highly populated.

In addition to the cultural overprint, a geological barrier to water sampling and gradient measurement also exists. A large part of the area has a thick glacial cover, and abundant water supplies are available near the surface, precluding the need for deep wells penetrating rock.

In spite of these hurdles, however, significant headway has been made in evaluating the geothermal potential in the area.

2.0 GEOCHEMICAL METHODS

Three geochemical methods have been applied to this area in order to characterize the water chemistry, determine the extent of the area over which the potential geothermal fluids are issuing, and to try and identify geothermal components (if any) being added to the system. These methods have provided indirect evidence of a geothermal system.

2.1 Water Chemistry

Water samples were collected from abandoned and operating wells producing saline and carbonated waters in a nine-county area surrounding the Capital District. The samples were analyzed for a complex suite of elements, including: Na; K; Ca; Mg; Cl; SO₄; Br; nitrogen species; total Fe; SiO₂; Al; F; I; phosphate; Ba; Sr; Li; Hg; Zn; TOC; and, total solids. Water temperature, pH, and titrated alkalinity were determined at the time of sampling.
Results of these analyses were difficult to interpret because of a complex mixing problem of the saline and carbon dioxide-rich components with the surface waters, and an apparent ionic filtration of the waters away from assumed zones of issuance. The most concentrated solutions, however, and those producing the more unusual trace element compositions did tend to be associated with major fault zones, particularly in the Saratoga Springs vicinity. Perhaps the most notable trace indicator present in high concentrations was silica, occurring in concentrations up to 70 ppm in Saratoga Springs itself. Other trace elements of interest that occur in these waters include boron (up to 4 ppm), lithium (up to 25 ppm), fluorine (up to 4.6 ppm), and strontium (up to 100 ppm). Oxygen and carbon isotopes were previously measured on carbon dioxide gas exsolving from the Saratoga waters, and the pertinent ratios indicated a thermal origin for the gas. Another series of isotope analyses are currently underway.

2.2 Silica-Water Temperature Analysis
Consequent to finding high silica contents in some waters in Saratoga Springs, an effort was made to determine the extent of the silica anomaly. Water samples were collected from wells penetrating bedrock in a broad area around Saratoga Springs and analyzed for silica content and water temperature. A correlation of higher silica contents and warmer temperatures was noted, and a general trend of slightly higher silica contents around Saratoga Springs and along the fault zones, decreasing away from these areas. No values of the magnitude noted in Saratoga Springs were found elsewhere, but the pattern observed appears to be useful in exploration and the data base will be increased and further analyzed. Silica geothermometry applied to the highest measured SiO₂ concentration (70 ppm) yields a last equilibration temperature of approximately 89°C for a chalcedony silica species, and of 118°C for a quartz silica species.
2.3 Gas Analyses

Water samples for dissolved gas analyses and free gas samples were collected at the same time water chemistry samples were taken, and analyzed for carbon dioxide, oxygen and argon, nitrogen, helium, and light hydrocarbons. Some difficulty was experienced in avoiding air contamination of the samples, either during sampling, or through the plumbing system, limiting the amount of information obtained from the program.

Carbon dioxide has long been known to exsolve from the waters at Saratoga Springs, but has not been recognized elsewhere in the area. This work indicated that the CO₂ is exsolving from a much larger area, and that it is associated with the major faults in the area. Methane was also determined to be a major component of the gases, with apparently increasing concentration to the south of the area of interest. Helium was present in some gas samples in quantities exceeding 4000 ppm, but it does not have a clear association with either the CO₂ or methane.

3.0 GEOPHYSICAL TECHNIQUES

Three geophysical techniques have been employed in the Capital District area, including a microseismic monitoring network, a small-scale gravity survey, and a temperature gradient measurement program.

3.1 Seismic Monitoring

Members of the New York State Geological Survey have set up a five-station seismic network in an effort to determine whether there is unusual fault activity or seismic noise which might be geothermally related. The network operated for a period of four months during which time eight minor earthquakes were recorded. Two of these were just west of Lebanon Springs, and one on the northern extension of the McGregor Fault. All reported earthquakes were compatible with the historical record for the area.

The vicinity around Saratoga Springs is an area of non-recorded tremors. Tremors were reported during the operational period
of the seismic network, but the instruments did not record the events.

An alteration of the station distribution is planned to more effectively cover the area of interest.

3.2 Gravity Survey
The gravity data base for the Saratoga Springs to Schenectady area was expanded, and existing data was recalculated and contoured to show more clearly the configurations of gravity anomalies in the area. Negative bouguer gravity anomalies were emphasized in the areas west and south of Saratoga Springs and also just to the south of Schenectady. These gravity features cannot be directly related to the thermal system we are dealing with at this time, but there is a general correlation of high thermal gradients and carbonated waters with them. Further work may be merited in this area.

3.3 Temperature Gradient Measurements
Approximately 80 thermal gradients have been measured in abandoned water wells ranging in depth from 80 to 605 meters using a thermistor probe and a Yellow Springs Instruments thermometer. This has been the most successful indicator of a possible geothermal system to date, with the highest reproducible gradient thus far measured of 44.3°C/km. The highest gradients observed are in the area between Saratoga Springs and Schenectady and appear to be strongly related to the Saratoga and McGregor Faults. The regional background appears to be on the order of 8°C/km to 10°C/km based on gradients measured around the area. Bearing this in mind, we have a system apparently producing gradients from two to four times background and even up to almost two times the worldwide average gradient. It is extremely important to determine if these gradients can be extended to depth, and future efforts will be in that direction.
4.0 CONCLUSIONS AND PROJECTIONS

4.1 Conclusions

Direct evidence of anomalous geothermal heat has been demonstrated through the measurement of temperature gradients in abandoned water wells throughout the Capital District. New and previous geochemical data support these results and indicate that the Saratoga and McGregor Faults are acting as major conduits for mineralized waters and thermally derived carbon dioxide. Issuant points for these waters and higher geothermal gradients correspond with gravity anomalies in the area which are also suggestive of conduits from depth.

4.2 Projections

Further exploration will involve an expanded silica sampling program, continued seismic monitoring of the area, continued thermal gradient measurements in abandoned wells, and a drilling program designed to confirm some of the higher gradients and to determine the value of the geothermal resource in the Capital District.
AN EVALUATION OF THE HYDROTHERMAL RESOURCES OF NORTH DAKOTA

Kenneth L. Harris, Francis L. Howell, Laramie M. Winczewski, Brad L. Wartman, Howard R. Umphrey, and Sidney B. Anderson

For the past two years, the North Dakota Geological Survey has been working under a cooperative agreement with the Department of Energy, Division of Geothermal Energy (DOE-FC07-79ID12030) to evaluate North Dakota's hydrothermal resources.

Our first year of work utilized the North Dakota Geological Survey's (NDGS) oil and gas well data to evaluate deep, principally Paleozoic, aquifers. Information from the NDGS oil and gas well files was encoded and compiled into a computer library system (WELLFILE). Data stored in WELLFILE was used to summarize the depth, thickness, expected temperature, and water quality of potential hydrothermal aquifers.

A geothermal gradient map (fig. 1) of North Dakota was produced by interrogating WELLFILE for the recorded bottom-hole-temperature and total depth of wells drilled in the state. Gradients were calculated (fig. 2) and the average gradient for each township was contoured. The geothermal gradient map is displayed in degrees Celsius per kilometre so that it may be easily compared with geothermal gradient maps produced by other workers in the region.

Using the information contained in WELLFILE, we can summarize the hydrothermal prospects of the Mississippian Madison Formation. Four important factors in evaluating a potential hydrothermal aquifer are depth, thickness, water temperature, and water quality. WELLFILE was interrogated for the depth of the top and base of the Mississippian Madison Formation in order to construct maps showing the depth to and the thickness of the Madison (fig. 3 and 4). An expected water temperature map was constructed by mapping the bottom-hole-temperatures of all wells, on record, that bottomed in the Madison (fig. 5). The Madison Formation water quality map (fig. 6) was
produced by mapping the total dissolved solids reported in analyses of water recovered from Madison drill stem tests. The Madison Formation is a medium- to low-temperature hydrothermal reservoir. The water contained in the reservoir is typically very high in NaCl, with concentrations of total dissolved solids as high as 300,000 mg/l. Although the Madison contains water in a useful temperature range, the generally poor quality of the water and great depth will probably prevent its development as a significant hydrothermal aquifer in North Dakota.

Since oil and gas exploration is confined mainly to the western two-thirds of the state, any study based solely on these data does not provide information on the entire state. Consequently our second year of work utilized "shallow" well data to fill in those gaps left by our previous study and to evaluate the hydrothermal potential of shallower aquifer systems in areas of interest indicated by our study of the oil and gas data. Our efforts have been directed at three main tasks: geothermal gradient and heat flow studies, stratigraphic studies, and water quality studies.

Geothermal gradient and heat flow studies have involved the temperature logging of available groundwater observation wells (fig. 7); and locating, obtaining access to, and casing "holes-of-opportunity" to be used as heat flow determination sites (fig. 8). Information obtained from the temperature logs of groundwater observation wells will be used to construct a geothermal gradient map, and expected temperature maps for the upper 100 metres (328 feet) of sediment in the state. Although this work is not yet completed, figure 9 shows a preliminary geothermal gradient map based on groundwater observation well temperature logs run this past year.

Stratigraphic studies and water quality studies involve the continued development and expansion of our WELLFILE system. Information on "shallow"
observation wells, water wells, and other test holes, drilled throughout the state, has been collected for the past twenty years. This county by county groundwater resource study has been conducted jointly by the North Dakota Geological Survey, North Dakota State Water Commission (NDSWC), and United States Geological Survey Water Resources Division (USGSWRD). We have obtained digitized magnetic tape summaries of the data collected through these studies from the USGSWRD. The information contained on these tapes has been reduced and assembled in a computer library system (WATERCAT). Summaries of the depth, thickness, expected water temperature, and water quality can now be constructed for "shallow" aquifer systems in North Dakota.
FIGURE 1 - GEOTHERMAL GRADIENT. THE CONTOUR INTERVAL IS 5°C/Km.

FIGURE 2 - METRIC GEOTHERMAL GRADIENT vs BOTTOM-HOLE-TEMPERATURE (°F) AND TOTAL DEPTH (feet).
FIGURE 3 - DEPTH TO MADISON, CONTOUR INTERVAL IS 200 METERS.

FIGURE 4 - ISOPACH MAP OF THE MADISON, CONTOUR INTERVAL IS 100 METERS.
FIGURE 5 - ISOTERM MAP OF THE EXPECTED TEMPERATURE OF MADISON WATER, CONTOUR INTERVAL IS 10°C.

FIGURE 6 - CONCENTRATION OF TOTAL DISSOLVED SOLIDS (TDS) IN THE MISSISSIPPIAN MADISON FORMATION. CONTOUR INTERVAL IS 50,000 Mg/l.
Location - LaMoure Co., T-133N, R-66W, Sect. 23, DDD
Date drilled - 10/15/74
Total depth - 134 m (440 ft.)
Surface elevation - 591 m (1940 ft.)
Temp. log run - 08/30/80

FIGURE 7 - TEMPERATURE LOG RUN ON A GROUNDWATER OBSERVATION WELL. GENERAL WELL DESCRIPTION IS GIVEN AT RIGHT SIDE OF THE TEMPERATURE-DEPTH PLOT.
Location - Kidder Co., T-144N, R-70W, Sec. 14, CBC

Date drilled - 07/24/80
Total depth - 241 m (793 ft.)
Surface elevation - 570 m (1870 ft.)
Temp. log run - 08/30/80

FIGURE 8 - TEMPERATURE LOG RUN ON A "HOLE-OF-CONVENIENCE" CASED AS A HEAT FLOW DETERMINATION SITE. GENERAL WELL DESCRIPTION IS GIVEN AT THE RIGHT SIDE OF THE TEMPERATURE DEPTH PLOT.
FIGURE 9 - PRELIMINARY "SHALLOW" GEOTHERMAL GRADIENT MAP OF NORTH DAKOTA. BASED ON MEASURED TEMPERATURES BETWEEN 30 AND 100 METRES IN 241 GROUNDWATER OBSERVATION WELLS. CONTOUR INTERVAL IS 5°C/Km.
ASSESSMENT OF GEOTHERMAL POTENTIAL IN OKLAHOMA

M. Lynn Prater
Kenneth V. Luza
William E. Harrison

Oklahoma Geological Survey
University of Oklahoma
830 Van Vleet Oval
Norman, OK 73019

Abstract

The Oklahoma Geological Survey program to assess geothermal potential in the State involves two types of activity. One part of our program is directed toward the preparation of a detailed geothermal-gradient map of Oklahoma at a scale of 1:500,000. Our second area of activity concerns site-specific investigations of gradient and subsurface conditions in areas that appear to have geothermal potential.

The best and most detailed geothermal-gradient map prepared for Oklahoma to date was the result of thesis research done at Oklahoma State University. Unfortunately, the Panhandle and northeastern and southeastern Oklahoma were not included in the study, so that these areas remained to be mapped. The American Association of Petroleum Geologists' North American Geothermal Project provided the data base for the Oklahoma State University work. Several correction factors (such as maximum time since circulation, air-drilled versus mud-drilled, and geologic province) were applied to the raw data and to electric-log data in determining gradients.
We are expanding this program to the unmapped areas of the State and have identified several specific areas that warrant detailed study. One of these areas is northeast of Tulsa, where recent mapping has shown the highest gradients (2.4°F/100 feet) noted thus far. Such high gradients were not originally anticipated in the northeastern Oklahoma province. We are presently mapping the southeastern part of Oklahoma and collecting data for the Panhandle. We anticipate completion of this mapping sometime this summer.

The objectives of this part of the program are twofold. First, we will make equilibrated temperature measurements to establish the presence of a geothermal anomaly. Our second objective will be to make estimates of the volume and deliverability of formation water potentially available for geothermal applications. These studies are similar to the reserve calculations commonly made by reservoir engineers. Studies of the Cromwell and Spiro sandstones (Lower Pennsylvanian) in the Haskell County area are nearing completion, and similar investigations of subsurface formations in Pittsburg County will soon be initiated.

Temperature data from electric logs usually indicate geothermal gradients that are somewhat lower than measurements obtained after thermal equilibration. Our field-confirmation work will permit us to determine two important factors with respect to the relation of electric-log temperature data to equilibration temperatures. We then will be able to ascertain (1) the magnitude of the variation and (2) whether the variation is systematic. If the difference between electric-log temperature and true temperature is systematic, it may be possible to make a standard correction to the geothermal-gradient map in order to obtain an approximation of equilibration temperatures. Should the difference, however, vary with other characteristics (such as petrophysics or geologic province), correction factors will be somewhat more complicated.
GEOTHERMAL ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES IN OREGON, 1979-1980, AND A CASE STUDY EXAMPLE AT POWELL BUTTES, OREGON

George R. Priest (Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries)
Gerald L. Black (Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries)
David D. Blackwell (Southern Methodist University)
David E. Brown (Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries)

The Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI) has, for the last two years, been involved in two major geothermal resource studies. One project concerned regional assessment of the northern and central Cascade Range, while the other was aimed at site-specific assessment of various areas for direct-use (low- to moderate-temperature) geothermal resources. The Cascade Range study was recently expanded to include the southern Cascade Range of Oregon. Study areas for both assessment programs are outlined on Figure 1.

The Cascades project consisted of two major investigations. The Mount Hood project entailed detailed resource assessment around Mount Hood including drilling of a 1,837 m well at Old Maid Flat. Most of the Department's effort was directed at the other major investigation which involved collection and interpretation of regional gravity, aeromagnetics, heat flow, water chemistry, and geologic data on the Cascades. Dr. Richard Couch of Oregon State University produced an aeromagnetic map and free-air, complete Bouguer, and residual gravity maps of the range to nearly complete his coverage from previous studies. Only the aeromagnetic map set is not complete, owing to lack of data in the northern Cascades. Heat-flow analysis involved drilling 22 150 m temperature gradient holes and scrounging for additional water well data. The geologic studies included paleomagnetic studies (James Magill and Allan Cox of Stanford University), regional lineament analysis (subcontracted to specialists), and local detailed mapping by G.R. Priest and assistants in areas with special tectonic significance.

During the low- to moderate-temperature assessment project, spring chemistry, heat flow, geophysics, geology, and water chemistry data were compiled for twelve areas in Oregon (Figure 1). Nine of these areas have been selected for extensive detailed assessment, primarily on the basis of their proximity to population centers, and thus greater probability for utilization (Figure 1). A literature search was conducted for each of the areas, and temperature gradients and water compositions have been measured in most of the twelve areas (Brown, Black, and McLean, 1980a, b; Brown, McLean, and Black, 1980a, b, c: Brown, McLean, Priest, Woller, and Black, 1980; Brown, McLean, Woller, and Black, 1980; Peterson, Brown, and McLean, 1980).

Detailed assessment of the nine priority areas involves more extensive water sampling and temperature gradient measurement than in the other areas. In some cases (e.g., Corbett-Moffett, Parkdale, Harney Basin, La Grande, Vale-Ontario, Lakeview, Belknap-Foley, and Willamette Pass), original geologic maps are being produced to aid in interpretation of the heat flow and water data. In
FIGURE 1. Major study areas for the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries geothermal project.
the highest priority areas, temperature gradient wells have been or will be
drilled (e.g., Corbett-Moffett, Powell Buttes, Harney Basin, Lakeview, La
Grande, and Willamette Pass). The most extensive drilling was conducted at
Powell Buttes, which the Department identified as a "blind" geothermal anomaly
in 1978. The investigation of the Powell Buttes area is a good example of the
Department's geothermal exploration strategy and will be discussed in some
detail in a later report by Gerald Black of DOGAMI.

Rumors of warm wells in the Powell Buttes area caught the attention of
the Department in 1977, and preliminary temperature gradient measurements in
1978 indicated that the area had abnormally high temperatures at shallow depths.
Subsequent gradient measurements in 1979 and drilling of eight 150 m temperature
gradient holes in 1980 revealed a major temperature gradient anomaly with gradi-
ents as high as 164°C/km (Figure 2). A 461 m well was then drilled into the
anomaly in 1981 to test the temperature at depth (PB-1, Figures 2 and 3). It
must be emphasized that no drilling was done in the area until the project geolo-
gist was sure that he had very good geologic maps of the area, and all available
temperature gradients from water wells.

All data from the project were then carefully analyzed during the spring
of 1981. It became clear that several models could explain the elongate gradi-
ent anomaly on the southwest side of the buttes:

1. Forced convection along a fault or fracture system.

2. Lateral flow of warm water at shallow depths.

3. Juxtaposition of rocks of strongly contrasting conductivity. In this
third case, the gradient anomaly would then not imply a hydrothermal
convection system.

Careful measurement of thermal conductivity of drill cuttings and cores
allowed detailed heat flow modeling of the temperature data. This technique
put important quantitative constraints on the proposed models. Although heat
flow computations are not yet complete, it appears that either model 2 or 3 or
some combination of them could explain the anomaly. The temperature profile
in PB-1 (Figure 4) shows a sharp break in slope at the contact between the
Oligocene basement rocks (Clarion Formation) and the highly porous Mio-Pliocene
Deschutes Formation. This break in slope could be caused by very slowly moving
waters within the lower part of the younger rocks (Brown, Black, and McLean,
1980b), or by the low measured conductivity of the dry upper part of the porous
Mio-Pliocene sequence, or some combination of these factors. In any case, geo-
thermometric estimates of the reservoir temperatures of warm (300 to 400°C) shallow
water in the thermal anomaly indicate that original water temperatures were
similar to measured temperatures (Brown, Black, and McLean, 1980b). This further
suggests that the warmth of these waters is obtained from shallow conductive
heating rather than deep convection. It is possible, however, that the shallow
thermal water has moved so slowly from depth that it reequilibrated with lower-
temperature, near-surface rocks, thus masking effects of a much higher temperature
reservoir.

Figure 5 illustrates how isotherms would be generated through the Powell
Buttes area by assuming a deep heat flow of 3.0 H.F.U. (considered normal for
Figure 2: Isogradient map of the Powell Buttes area, Oregon. (From Brown, Black, and McLean, 1980b)
Figure 3: Geologic cross-section and isothermal plot through drill holes. (Modified from Brown, Black, and McLean, 1980b)
Figure 4: Lithologic and Temperature Log of Powell Buttes No. 1 Intermediate Gradient Hole.
Cross section is through PB-1 (16S/14E-16Aba) and parallel to A-A'. The thermal conductivities (in cal/cm sec °C) of the blocks are weighted averages of measurements made on cutting samples from PB-1. 10° isotherms were generated after 9909 years (500 iterations) from an input of 3.0 HFU at the base of the model. The temperature of Block V was maintained at 16°C to simulate high water flow rates in the basalt aquifers to the west of the buttes.
this region) over a period of about 10,000 years. The computer program takes into account the measured conductivity of the stratigraphic sequence and shows how the highly conductive rhyolitic dome on the east side of the anomaly could combine with the heat sink of water-saturated younger rocks on the west side to produce a purely conductive thermal anomaly. Preliminary calculations indicate that a similar thermal model could be generated by very slow flow of warm water through permeable surface rocks. It must be emphasized that these models are mathematical possibilities and do not constitute proof.

The models should be tested by additional intermediate-level (600 m) drilling below the insulating Mio-Pliocene cap rocks. The relatively high absolute temperature of the anomalous area also indicates that relatively high temperatures can be realized at moderate depths (e.g., 150°C at about 1840 m or about 6,050 ft.). Deepening PB-1 to about 1,220 m (4,000 ft.) would help to assess the permeability of deeper reservoir rocks to evaluate the resource. Deep drilling should, however, be done with the realization that the older rocks (chiefly Clarno Formation) tend to be very impermeable in other areas where their hydrologic properties have been studied (e.g., Robison and Laenen, 1976). It might, therefore, be wiser to aim deep drilling at areas likely to have considerable fracture permeability. Such areas might be outlined by a careful program of intermediate-level drilling aimed at mapped faults and lineations within the thermal anomaly. Hopefully, areas with deep convection along fault and fracture zones would produce thermal anomalies which could be seen by intermediate-level drilling. In any case, the currently defined 30° to 40°C hydrothermal system can be used by local residents for a variety of direct-use applications.
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LINEAMENTS PERCEIVED ON LANDSAT IMAGERY OF CENTRAL TEXAS--
APPLICATIONS TO GEOTHERMAL RESOURCE ASSESSMENT

C. M. Woodruff, Jr. and S. Christopher Caran

Linear trends of various geologic, geochemical, and geophysical phenomena are commonly observed in conjunction with geothermal resources. Examples include the geographic control of warm springs in western Virginia by fracture zones that trend normal to prevailing Appalachian structures (Geiser, 1979). Similar cross-cutting relations occur in the Ouachita Mountains at Hot Springs, Arkansas (Bedinger and others, 1979). Lineaments have also been frequently employed as a tool to delineate hydrothermal manifestations (both as ore deposits and as thermal resources) in the Cordillera of western North America. Presumably the coincidence of hydrothermal phenomena and lineaments relates in a general way to structural/tectonic influences on heat flow and on the migration of fluids. Simply put, active tectonic zones are areas of crustal discontinuities (thin crust in rift zones, for example), locally high heat flow, and marked seismicity; some of the surface manifestations of active tectonism in these areas may be perceived as lineaments. Yet even for relict areas of tectonic disturbance (for example, "dormant" orogens), there commonly are thermal expressions that are thought to result from deep circulation of waters along fractures and steeply dipping beds. Such areas are also often denoted by lineaments. However, as observed by Steeples and others (1979), some of these presumed "dormant" areas may still be more active than is generally recognized; microseismicity, for example, may accompany local heat-flow anomalies, and if hydrologic conditions are favorable, a geothermal resource may occur.

1Publication authorized by the Director, Bureau of Economic Geology, The University of Texas at Austin.
The work by Steeples and coworkers is an important point of departure for our discussion, because that study dealt with a buried orogen, the Nemaha Ridge of the Mid-Continent. Moreover, the buried structure is also denoted by a trend of lineaments at the earth surface (McCauley and others, undated). Buried structural trends, then, may have surface expression through lineaments, and such features may be favorable loci for geothermal resources because of either locally high heat flow or heat convection by upwelling waters.

As part of a statewide assessment of geothermal resources in Texas, we evaluated lineaments perceived on Landsat images. The logic behind this effort is that, except for the Trans-Pecos area, Texas largely comprises terrain that is underlain by flat-lying sedimentary rocks. Fundamentally, our guiding hypotheses have been: 1.) geothermal anomalies accompany structural discontinuities; and 2.) structural discontinuities—even buried (or dormant) features—may be subtly expressed at the ground surface. A synoptic overview afforded by Landsat images provides a means to perceive large-scale (albeit subtle) features that indirectly indicate structural, hydrologic, and thermal anomalies.

We present here a case study that shows the convergence of seemingly diverse phenomena. As in the aforementioned studies of the Nemaha Ridge, we focus on a buried orogen—the Ouachita structural trend in Central Texas, a foundered hinge zone between the Texas Craton and the downwarping Gulf Coast Basin (fig. 1). Our aim is to show that lineaments may provide evidence for buried structures, which, in turn, apparently control the location of geothermal anomalies.

We developed a method for perceiving lineaments statewide that entailed each of three observers$^2$ independently viewing 51 Band-5 Landsat images for

$^2$For the study area, the third person was Gary E. Smith. Eric J. Thompson assisted in these efforts and worked subsequently on numerical evaluation of these lineaments.
Figure 1. Balcones/Ouachita structural trend, Central Texas and location of lineament study area.
Figure 2. Lineaments perceived in study area; note, Blackland Prairie is the physiographic area between the Hill Country and the Post Oak Belt.
two periods of 30 minutes each (see Caran and others, 1981). For a pilot study in Central Texas we also conjointly viewed several mosaicked images and thus mapped large-scale, throughgoing figures as "juried" lineaments (fig. 2) along with the other linear features that we perceived independently. These two operations resulted in our perceiving more than 400 lineaments in an area of approximately 8680 km². We consider the lineaments, thus perceived, to be "raw data" without particular value until they are interpreted. In short, there is probably a high "noise to signal" ratio in a depiction of this kind. The interpretation of these data should allow a better discrimination of the salient information (signal) from the random background (noise).

Two sets of features stand out in this depiction of lineaments in Central Texas. One set trends oblique to the strike of stratigraphic units (that is, oblique to the boundaries of the Hill Country and the Post Oak Belt as depicted in figure 2). The other set aligns roughly parallel to the prevailing strike.

The oblique-trending lineaments compose mainly "juried" lineaments, although there are also families of the generally shorter features perceived by individual observers that, in the aggregate, produce orientations oblique to strike. We have no hypotheses on the implications of these features, except to note that Pilot Knob, a Cretaceous marine volcanic plug southeast of Austin, lies along the intersection of two of these large lineaments (fig. 2). Also, the northwest orientation exhibited by some of these features parallels a predominant trend of the Brazos River alluvial valley which, when depicted at a regional-scale, may be a giant lineament extending for over 120 miles oblique to the structural and depositional strike of the region.

The lineament trend that is parallel to strike of strata is the expected set—especially along the Balcones Fault Zone. This is because of the abrupt discontinuity in bedrock, soils, vegetation, and land use that occurs along this
structural trend. There are similar but more subdued surface expressions along the contacts of most formations along the Gulf Coastal Plain of Texas. The initial implication of this set of lineaments is that we have merely rediscovered the Balcones Fault Zone, or we have perceived the contacts of mapped stratigraphic units. If these findings account for the entire significance of the strike-parallel lineaments, then that family of lines is clearly trivial. We intend to demonstrate, however, that we have, instead, perceived a previously unrecognized zone of structural dislocation that has implications on the location of geothermal resources in Central Texas.

Of the lineaments parallel to strike, one set is especially prominent. These features compose a northeast-trending family of lines along the boundary between the Post Oak Belt and the Blackland Prairie. The lineaments lie mainly along the alluvial reaches of Brushy Creek near its confluence with the San Gabriel River and the Little River system. We have named the feature the Brushy Creek Lineament. Actually, several lineaments make up this zone. They include the coincidence of a major (juried) lineament and a high density of parallel, smaller features that align with relict and modern stream reaches, a straight drainage divide, a west-facing topographic escarpment, and the contact between the Midway and Wilcox Groups of Eocene age. This stratigraphic contact is also responsible for the major physiographic break between the Post Oak Belt and the Blackland Prairie and the attendant changes in soils, vegetation, and land use.

The intriguing thing about this particular part of the Post Oak Belt/Blacklands border is its remarkable linearity. In fact, this family of lines is much more strongly expressed in our lineament survey than is the Balcones fault-line escarpment, which is an area of similar physiographic importance but one clearly documented as a structural zone. Yet, no major structural discontinuity has been previously documented between the Post Oak Belt and the Blackland Prairie;
there, only a single short fault is mapped at the surface along this trend (Barnes, 1974). It is our thesis that this lineament zone is the surface expression of a deep-seated structural disturbance of a significance similar to the Balcones fault trend farther west.

To test this thesis we collected several types of independent evidence that bear on subsurface structures in the area (fig. 3). We have located subsurface faults displacing the basal Cretaceous Hosston Sand and the (shallower) Edwards Limestone (see Woodruff and McBride, 1979). We also obtained additional well data and constructed a new map showing faults displacing the Buda Limestone (a prominent subsurface datum on electric logs) along the trend of the Brushy Creek Lineament.

Several other structurally related phenomena also converge along this lineament trend. They include buried igneous plugs and associated oil fields, the updip subcrop limit of Jurassic rocks (the first indication of marine conditions along the western margin of the Gulf of Mexico during Mesozoic time), and the proximity of major basement discontinuities in the Ouachita rocks as mapped by Flawn and others (1961). In short, the convergence of these diverse structural data indicate that the Brushy Creek Lineament zone delimits the eastern part of the Ouachita hinge, just as surface faults of the Balcones system roughly delimit the western margin of that hinge.

The eastern margin of the Balcones/Ouachita structural trend is important in a geothermal context because this zone marks a major change in orientation of depositional systems—from dip-fed fluvial sand bodies on the west to strike-fed lagoonal and marine, sand, mud, and carbonate deposits on the east. This change in depositional systems (documented by Woodruff and McBride, 1979) marks the deepest part of a hydrologic system that allows ready access of meteoric recharging waters to depths sufficient for markedly increased water temperature.
Figure 3. Surface and subsurface structural features in study area; note convergence of features near the Brushy Creek Lineament southwest of Cameron.
(given prevailing geothermal gradient) while maintaining low to moderate concentrations of dissolved solids.

A contour map of geothermal gradients across the study area shows gradient anomalies to generally align along the trend of the Brushy Creek Lineament (fig. 4). These anomalies may not indicate a zone of high heat flow (as would be expected in an area of active tectonism) but instead may indicate a locus of upwelling waters. The alignment of oil fields argues for this interpretation, in that the igneous plugs provide the preferred avenues for upward flow of waters and entrained hydrocarbons. As pointed out by Plummer and Sargent (1931), such areas of upwelling waters and hydrocarbons are part of expected basin-wide hydrologic interactions that also include geothermal gradient anomalies and the occurrence of warm (often saline) waters at a relatively shallow depth.

There are several thermal water wells in our study area. No discernible trend exists, however, because the locations of these wells are dictated by the prior siting of towns for which the wells supply water. On the basis of this lineament survey, we conclude that an exploration program for hydrothermal waters of potable quality should focus on the western side of the lineament zone in order to tap downward flowing recharge systems within the dip-oriented depositional facies. Hotter waters may occur on the eastern side of the lineament zone, but these would largely be upwelling waters from deep within the Gulf Coast Basin, and thus salinity would probably be quite high.

In summary, lineaments may provide a tool for locating "blind" geothermal resources, because they are subtle indications of subjacent tectonic disturbances in areas covered by flat-lying rocks. Lineaments may be the surface expressions of fractures propagated upward through undisturbed strata. Such fractures may provide enhanced permeability avenues for downward flow of recharging
Figure 4. Geothermal gradient contours across lineament study area.
waters to a depth sufficient for thermal enhancement above mean annual air tempera-
ture. Also, such areas of high lineament concentrations may mark the loci of
upwelling of hot (and often saline) waters from deep within a sedimentary basin.
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ABSTRACT

Two known geothermal areas have been investigated previously by Murphy and Gwynn (1979) in the Jordan Valley, Salt Lake County, Utah. These two reports indicate meteoric water is being circulated to depth and heated by the ambient temperature derived from normal heat flow. This warm water subsequently migrates upward along permeable fault zones.

The gravity survey conducted in the valley indicates a number of fault blocks are present beneath the unconsolidated valley sediments (Plate II). The faults bounding these blocks could provide conduits for the upward migration of warm water.

Four areas of warm water wells, in addition to the two known geothermal areas, have been delineated in the valley (Plate III). However, the chemistry of the Jordan Valley is quite complex and at this time is not fully understood in regard to geothermal potential (Plates IV and V).

Thick sequences of unconsolidated valley fill could conceal geothermal areas due to lateral dispersion or dilution within the principal aquifer, as well as retardation of warm water flow allowing time for cooling prior to discharge in wells or springs. Other areas are possibly diluted and cooled by high quality, ground water recharge from snow melt in the Wasatch Range.

INTRODUCTION

The Utah Geological and Mineral Survey (UGMS) has been conducting research to advance the utilization of low-temperature geothermal resources in the State of Utah as per U. S. Department of Energy (DOE) contract DE-AS07-77ET28393. Prior to this study, UGMS was concentrating its investigations on known geothermal areas along the Wasatch Front from Utah Valley north to the Idaho/Utah state line. The concentration of the study in this region was due primarily to the number of known geothermal resources near major population centers of the state, hopefully resulting in timely resource development.

In February, 1980 it was determined that efforts should begin in the evaluation of the area wide geothermal resource potential of the following Wasatch Front Valleys: (1) Utah Valley, (2) Jordan Valley; (3) Ogden Valley; (4) Bear River Valley; (5) Malad Valley, and (6) Cache Valley. These areas were decided upon because of their inherent low temperature geothermal potential and because they encompass the three major population centers of the state. The initial major effort in this assessment study was concentrated in the Jordan Valley because of the inclusion of Salt Lake City, the major population center.

PHYSIOGRAPHIC SETTING

The Jordan Valley encompasses an area of approximately 1024 square kilometers (400 square miles) in north-central Utah in central Salt Lake County (figure 1). This valley has substantial relief, ranging in elevation from 1280 meters (4200 feet) at the Great Salt Lake to approximately 1585 meters (5200 feet) where adjoining the mountains. The east side of the valley is a boundary between two major physiographic provinces: the Rocky Mountain province to the east and the Basin and Range province to the west.

The Jordan Valley is bounded to the east, south, and west by the Wasatch, Traverse, and Oquirrh mountain ranges, respectively, while the north end is open to the Ogden Valley with an arbitrary boundary being an extension of the Salt Lake salient which is an intermediate fault block that extends west from the Wasatch Mountains into the valley for approximately 6.4 km (4 miles), (figure 1). The Wasatch Mountains, including the Salt Lake salient, are part of the Rocky Mountain physiographic province while the Traverse and Oquirrh Mountains are part of the Basin and Range province.
Figure 1. Index map of the Jordan Valley, Utah, showing ground-water districts and subdistricts (modified from Marine and Price, 1964)
A principal water source to the Jordan Valley is the Jordan River which flows north from Utah Valley through a gap in the Traverse Mountains referred to as the Jordan Narrows and continues through the entire length of the valley, eventually entering into the Great Salt Lake. In addition to the Jordan River, the other principal water sources are the creeks draining the Wasatch Mountains (figure I).

REGIONAL GEOLOGIC SETTING

Rocks of Pre-Cambrian through Pliocene Age are exposed in the mountains bordering the Jordan Valley. In the Wasatch Mountains, sedimentary and metamorphic rocks consist of Pre-Cambrian; Paleozoic, Mesozoic, and Cenozoic sandstone, limestone, shale, conglomerate, siltstone, tuffaceous clay, tillite, quartzite, shist and gneiss. Intrusive rocks consist of early Tertiary monzonite, diorite and granodiorite, and in places are covered by Pleistocene glacial deposits as well as alluvium.

The core of the Traverse Mountains is primarily composed of the Pennsylvanian Oquirrh formation consisting of quartzite with some calcareous sandstone and limestone. In some areas the quartzite has been broken and cemented in place — Marsell (1932) referred to this as “autoclastic breccia”. Also, some Mississippian-Pennsylvanian age Manning Canyon shale and Mississippian Great Blue Limestone are present. Tertiary rocks consist of the Salt Lake group of Slentz (1955) which generally is composed of marlstone, mudstone, siltstone, travertine, and clastobreccia. Tertiary volcanics, primarily of andesite and augite-andesite porphyry composition, are also present.

Rocks of the Paleozoic Oquirrh Mountain facies are the primary units exposed in the Oquirrh Mountains. The following formations, according to Crittenden (1964), comprise the Oquirrh Mountain facies: The Great Blue Limestone, the Manning Canyon shale, the Oquirrh Formation, the Kirkham Limestone, and the Diamond Creek Sandstone. These formations are somewhat different in the central and northern parts of the range where units in the central area are referred to as the Bingham sequence while units to the north are the Rogers Canyon sequence. Tertiary rocks, also, are exposed in the Oquirhrs. These include: (1) Harker’s fanglomerate of Slentz’s (1953) Salt Lake group, (2) andesite and latite-andesite flows, and (3) intrusive stocks, sills and dikes of granite, monzonite, granite porphyry and rhyolite - quartz latite.

Generally, the sediments exposed in the Jordan Valley consist of unconsolidated deposits of boulders, gravel, sand, silt, and clay deposited by streams, lakes, glaciers, wind, and mass wasting during Quaternary and Recent time. Isolated outcrops of pre-Quaternary rocks are found in areas where sediments extend from the bordering mountains. Subsurface sediments differ greatly from surface sediments in the valley and will therefore be described later in detail, since they comprise the aquifers tapped by the wells investigated for the geothermal assessment study.

REGIONAL STRUCTURAL SETTING

The Jordan Valley is at the intersection of three major tectonic elements: (1) the north-trending thrusts and folds known as the Sevier orogenic belt which extends from southern Nevada to the northwest corner of Alaska (Crittenden, 1976); (2) the east-trending Uinta Arch; and (3), the north-south trending Basin and Range faulting.

Thrusting

Three episodes of thrusting have been discovered in the Wasatch Mountains east of the Jordan Valley. The first two are known as the Alta and Mount Raymond thrusts dated at 125 and 85-90 million years old respectively (Crittenden, 1964). The third, and most extensive, is the Charleston-Nebo Thrust, reported to have a displacement of 64 kilometers (40 miles) or more from the west and dated at 75-80 million years (Crittenden, 1964). The inferred trace of this thrust fault has been extended westward between the east Traverse Mountains and the Little Cottonwood Stock disappearing beneath the Jordan Valley sediments where it is believed to continue to the northwest. It then passes between Antelope and Fremont Islands, eventually connecting with its northern counterpart, the Willard-Paris thrust, east of Ogden (Crittenden, 1964). The identification of this fault explains why the Pennsylvania rocks of the Oquirrh and Traverse Mountains differ from the rocks of the Wasatch east of the Jordan Valley and also explains why there is no visible continuation of the Uinta anticline in the Oquirhrs.
The Uinta arch is the largest structural feature within the Wasatch Range (figure 2). It consists of a broad anticline oriented in an east-west direction forming the axis of the Uinta Mountains. East of the Jordan Valley, the anticline is exposed at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon where the axis plunges approximately 30 degrees east.

Another significant structural event, block faulting of the Basin and Range, occurred in the late-Tertiary with the Jordan Valley being part of the eastern border. The “Wasatch Fault Zone”, which extends along the east side of the valley, separates the Basin and Range from the Wasatch Mountains. This fault zone is part of the Intermountain Seismic Belt, a 100 kilometer (62.5 mile) wide zone of high seismic activity extending from northern Arizona to northwestern Montana (figure 3). Seismic studies indicate the zone is an active rift system with the tensional axis oriented in an east-west direction (Murphy, 1979).

GEOLOGY OF THE JORDAN VALLEY

Marine and Price (1964) divided the Jordan Valley into six ground water districts, three of which are divided into a total of nine subdistricts based on geologic characteristics of driller’s logs and well cuttings (figure 1). The following is a brief description of their account of the geologic materials characteristic of each of these areas:

East Bench District

The East Bench district is bounded to the north, south and west by the East Bench fault and to the east by the Wasatch Mountains (figure 1). South of Emigration Creek a pediment extends approximately 1.6 Kilometers (1 mile) west of the range front and is primarily composed of sandstone, limestone and shale of Jurassic and Triassic age. In most areas, this pediment is only a few feet below the surface and is covered by channel sands and gravels. In other areas of the district the sediments consist predominantly of boulders, gravel, sand, silt and clay. The sources of this material are primarily mud rock flows as well as channel, colluvial and flood-plain deposits. Thicknesses of these materials range from less than 1 meter (3.28 feet) in the area of the pediment to as much as 213 meters (700 feet) in the alluvial fans at the mouths of Parleys and Mill Creek Canyons.

East Lake Plain District

The East Lake Plain district is bounded to the east by the East Bench fault, to the west by the Jordan River, to the north by the Salt Lake salient and to the south by an abandoned channel of Big Cottonwood Creek (figure 1). This district is divided into three subdistricts which are as follows:

East Lake Plain Subdistrict

The East Lake Plain subdistrict is composed principally of lake bottom clays with intercalated, discontinuous lenses of gravel. In places, these sediments are modified by recent flood plain deposits of the Jordan River as well as by the broad alluvial fans of City Creek, Emigration Creek, Parleys Creek and Mill Creek. These deposits are underlain at depth by sediments of the Lake Bonneville Group which in turn are underlain by pre-Lake Bonneville deposits. Underlying these unconsolidated sediments are Tertiary limestone or shale. Shale was encountered in a well in Section 12, T. 1 S., R. 1 W at 356 meters (1,168 feet).

City Creek Fan Subdistrict

The City Creek Fan subdistrict sediments are pre-Lake Bonneville alluvial fan material consisting primarily of well-sorted boulders and gravel. The Wasatch formation underlies this subdistrict at a depth of approximately 152 meters (500 feet).
Figure 2. Generalized structure of central Wasatch Range east of Salt Lake City (from Crittenden, 1976, p. 365)
Figure 3. Epicenter map of the Intermountain seismic belt (from Arabasz and others, 1979)
North Bench Subdistrict

The North Bench subdistrict consists of interfaced pre-Lake Bonneville mud-rock flows, Lake Bonneville deposits and Recent mud rock flows. To the east and south, these deposits grade into the City Creek Fan subdistrict and Lake Plain subdistrict deposits respectively. Generally the deposits consist of boulders, gravel and clay.

Cottonwoods District

The Cottonwoods district is bounded to the north by an abandoned channel of Big Cottonwood Creek and the East Bench fault, to the east by the "Wasatch Fault Zone", to the south by Dry Creek, and to the west by the Jordan River (figure 1). Sediments in the district have been derived from a number of sources, which are as follows: (1) glacial outwash and till, (2) lake deposits, including spits and deltas, and (3) alluvium and colluvium. The sediments primarily consist of gravel and sand. The gravel and sand predominate near the mountain front with the clay increasing toward the Jordan River. Depth to bedrock ranges from a few feet at the Bonneville shore level to more than 3000 feet beneath the Jordan River (Everitt, 1979).

Southeast District

The southeast district is bounded to the north by Dry Creek, to the east by the "Wasatch Fault Zone", to the south by the Traverse Mountains and to the west by the Jordan River (figure 1). A pediment, formed on the Oquirrh formation, extends northward from the East Traverse Mountains into the valley and is covered by lakeshore sand and gravel. In the Jordan Narrows, gravel and clay have been logged to a depth of approximately 46 meters (150 feet), and are underlain by the Salt Lake Group of Slentz (1955). In most other areas of the district, unconsolidated sediments consist of Lake Bonneville spit sands and gravel and alluvial fan gravel, sand and clays. Depth to bedrock is from less than 305 meters (1000 feet) on the pediment to greater than 710 meters (2000 feet) at the Jordan River (Everitt, 1979).

West Slope District

The West Slope district is bounded to the south by the Traverse Mountains, to the west by the Oquirrh Mountains, to the north by a physiographic break in slope, to the northeast by the Granger fault scarp and to the east by the Jordan River (figure 1). This district includes a broad alluvial-pediment slope formed primarily on rocks of the Salt Lake Formation of Slentz (1955) and has been divided into two subdistricts which are as follows:

North Pediment Subdistrict

The North Pediment subdistrict consists of a thin layer of alluvial or lacustrine deposits overlying the lower units of the Salt Lake Group. Bedrock is considered to range from less than 305 meters (1000 feet) to more than 915 meters (3000 feet) in this subdistrict (Everitt, 1979).

South Fan Subdistrict

Deposits in the South Fan subdistrict consist primarily of gravel, boulders and clay of the Harker's fanglomerate and the Camp Williams units of the Salt Lake Group of Slentz (1955). The two units are, in turn, underlain by the Jordan Narrows unit. Depth to bedrock varies from less than 305 meters (1000 feet) to more than 915 meters (3000 feet) in this area (Everitt, 1979).

Northwest Lake Plain District

The Northwest Lake Plain district is bordered to the east by the Jordan River, to the south by the Oquirrh Mountains and the change in slope caused by the north boundary of the pediment extending east from the Oquirrhs, to the west and northwest by the Great Salt Lake and arbitrarily to the north by the Davis County Line (figure 1). The district is covered by Lake Bonneville bottom deposits. The underlying sediments are such that the district is divided into four subdistricts which are as follows.
Northwest Lake Plain Subdistrict

The Northwest Lake Plain Subdistrict consists of several thousand feet of lake clays with interbedded thin sand lenses. This unit is generally thought to extend to a depth of 700 meters (2300 feet) at which point approximately 152 meters (500 feet) of interbedded sand and andesite could be encountered which in turn is underlain by sand to 1067 meters (3500 feet). The Wasatch formation is thought to be present below this depth.

North Oquirrh Subdistrict

The North Oquirrh subdistrict consists of lake clay and silt, which thins to the south toward the Oquirrh Mountains while thickening to the north to approximately 137 meters (450 feet) at the Great Salt Lake. The clay and silt are underlain by a coarse angular gravel ranging from 46 to 137 meters (150 to 450 feet) in thickness. The gravel is, in turn, underlain by the Oquirrh formation.

South Margin Subdistrict

The South Margin subdistrict is underlain by approximately 30 meters (100 feet) of lake clay which, in turn, is underlain by 61 to 91 meters (200 to 300 feet) of alternating and variable thicknesses of gravel and clay beds which in turn are underlain by Oquirrh formation.

Mid-Jordan Subdistrict

The Mid-Jordan Subdistrict is underlain primarily by flood plain deposits of the Jordan River. Bedrock is known to be at a depth greater than 229 meters (750 feet) in this subdistrict; no known wells have penetrated bedrock in this area.

STRUCTURE OF THE JORDAN VALLEY

Faulting

The Jordan Valley is part of the Wasatch Front Valley physiographic subprovince of the Basin and Range physiographic province. The initial episode of block faulting which resulted in the elongated, parallel, north-south oriented mountain ranges with intervening basins, of which the Jordan Valley is one, occurred in Late Eocene (Eardley, 1955). Eardley has reported a second episode of block faulting which occurred in the Pliocene. Also, a number of faults in the surficial valley deposits indicate that faulting has occurred in Recent time although no major earthquakes have been recorded in historical time.

The “Wasatch Fault Zone” (the major zone of recent faulting) in the Jordan Valley separates the Wasatch Range from the valley from Corner Creek, section 3, T. 3 S., R. 1 E., to Mount Olympus, section 14, T. 2 S., R. 1 E., (Plate I). North of this location the recent faulting (East Bench Fault) extends to the northwest (Plate I). Van Horn (1972) has mapped another fault that continues around the base of Mount Olympus and then northwest along the base of the range front, north approximately 6.4 kilometers (4 miles), to section 15, T. 1 S., R. 1 E. (Plate I). Movement on this fault is thought to have occurred more than 5,000 years ago (Van Horn, 1972). North of this point, Van Horn (1969) considered the faulting to have occurred prior to 3,000,000 years ago. The East Bench fault continues to section 33, T. 1 N., R. 1 E. (Van Horn, 1969). An older branch of this fault (pre-5,000 years old according to Van Horn, 1972) continues from section 3, T. 1 S., R. 1 E., northeast to section 33, T. 1 N., R. 1 E., thereby rejoining the younger fault segment. A number of faults have been located in excavations in northern Salt Lake City which indicate a possible continuation of a branch of the East Bench fault northwest, eventually adjoining the Warm Springs fault system located at the base of the Salt Lake salient.

The East Bench fault forms the eastern boundary of a visible inner graben in the Jordan Valley. The western boundary of this inner graben is what Marine and Price (1964) have mapped as the Jordan Valley fault zone, which is approximately 1 mile wide, and includes the Granger fault to the west and the Taylorsville fault to the east (Plate I). This fault zone is oriented northwest-southeast and extends from approximately section 11, T. 2 S., R. 1 W., in the south to section 17, T. 1 S., R. 1 W., to the north. Evidence of other faulting that occurred prior to recent time is apparent in the Jordan Valley to the south and west.
The Traverse Mountains are separated from the valley by a normal fault referred to by Marine and Price (1964) (Plate I) as the Steep Mountain fault. Normal faulting has also been mapped by Slentz (1955) along the base of the Oquirrh Mountains between the Pennsylvanian Oquirrh formation and the Tertiary Harker's fanglomerate from the Traverse Mountains to just south of Bacchus (Plate I). Slentz (1955) reports that in places the fanglomerate is down-faulted to the east and in other areas the fault is buried beneath the fanglomerate.

Tooker and Roberts (1961) have mapped Sevier Orogeny thrust faulting at the north end of the Oquirrh Mountains (Plate I). Also, Van Horn (1975) has mapped a number of additional faults beneath the valley sediments based on geophysical investigations. (These fault locations are speculative and have not been included on Plate I).

**Site Specific Gravity Surveys**

Detailed gravity surveys were conducted by UGMS on two known low temperature geothermal resource areas in the Jordan Valley; the Warm Springs fault geothermal system and the Crystal Hot Springs geothermal system. The Warm Springs fault geothermal system is located at the western edge of the Salt Lake salient in the northern end of the valley (figure 4). The gravity survey consisted of 12 east-west oriented gravity lines with individual station spacings of 152 to 304 meters (500 to 1000 feet). Individual gravity lines were spaced from 0.4 to 1.2 km (0.25 to 0.75 miles) apart. One gravity profile was modeled using a three dimensional modeling program. The modeling indicates, from east to west, two faults, a deep alluvium-filled graben and a horst block; the easternmost fault corresponds to the Warm Springs fault. The model indicates the downthrown block of the Warm Spring fault to the west is covered by approximately 100 meters (328 feet) of alluvium (Murphy & Gwynn, 1979). The Hobo Springs fault (the second fault to the west) is also downthrown to the west and borders the aforementioned graben. This graben has an estimated depth of about 1220 meters (4000 feet).

The Crystal Hot Springs geothermal system is located in the southern part of the Jordan Valley, southwest of the town of Draper (figure 4). An areawide gravity survey was conducted by orienting profiles perpendicular to the East Traverse and Wasatch Mountain ranges. Profiles were spaced at nearly 0.8 kilometer (0.5 mile) intervals with approximately 304 meter (1000 feet) intervals between individual stations. The area-wide survey provided a regional setting on which to base a more detailed gravity grid to better delineate the structure beneath the springs (Murphy, 1981). The detailed grid consisted of 290 gravity stations, spaced 350 feet apart and was centered on the thermal springs.

The regional gravity surface resulting from the area-wide gravity survey indicates normal range-front fault segments bordering the west and north edges of the Wasatch and Traverse Mountain ranges respectively (Murphy, 1981). Murphy (1981) states that in the vicinity of the thermal springs, these faults trend almost east-west and abruptly terminate a gravity high to the south. In other areas, the presence of northeast trending faults is indicated.

Modeling of the data suggests Crystal Hot Springs is located between two range front faults striking roughly east-northeast, and dipping to the northwest (Murphy, 1981). Drill hole data has indicated a third range front fault to the northwest. Murphy (1981) also points out that the structure between the southernmost two range front faults is quite complex, consisting of a number of small, tilted fault blocks.

The detailed gravity surveys indicate that the Jordan Valley is very complex structurally, consisting of smaller scale bedrock horsts and grabens beneath unconsolidated valley sediments within the valley-wide graben. Work by Everitt (1979) and Arnow and Mattick (1968) also indicate a complex graben system within the Jordan Valley.

**Valley-Wide Gravity Surveys**

The structural complexity of the Jordan Valley initiated a gravity survey over the entire study area which consisted of 800 stations along 40 profiles at 0.4 to 0.8 kilometer (0.25 to 0.5 mile) intervals. This survey was designed to compliment the two site specific surveys and the work previously done by Cook and Berg (1961). The result of incorporating this data with the work previously done can be seen in the "Complete Bouguer Gravity Map" presented as Plate II. This map indicates that a number of major bedrock fault blocks may be present in the Jordan Valley. This could be significant because the borders of these aforementioned fault blocks could be conduits for geothermal water. Plate II indicates significant gravity lows in the Jordan Valley which could correspond to structural grabens whereas the
Figure 4. Location of the Warm Springs fault and Crystal Hot Springs geothermal systems, Salt Lake County, Utah
intervening gravity highs could indicate structural bedrock horsts.

Aero Magnetic Surveys

An aeromagnetic survey, 9.5 miles in length (north-south), 6 miles in width (east-west) and centered on Crystal Hot Springs, was flown to detail the complex magnetic surface of the area. Smith (1980) concluded that the resulting magnetic anomaly results from a series of magnetically susceptible intrusive and extrusive bodies that trend east-northeast and vary in depth from 2887 meters (7500 feet) to within 107 meters (350 feet) of the surface. The lower portions of the bodies are thought to be intrusive while the upper levels may be either intrusive dikes and sills or extrusive flows (Murphy, 1981). Smith (1980) noted that many of the stacked prisms used to model the intrusives shared common edges which could indicate the presence of deep seated structures. One of these deep seated structures is present just north of the thermal springs and may be coincident with faults delineated on the basis of gravity data (Murphy, 1981). Results of this survey and preliminary modeling by Smith (1980) provides an understanding of the distribution of the magnetic susceptibility in the subsurface and a major normal range front fault north of the springs (Murphy, 1981).

GROUND WATER

Ground water in the Jordan Valley occurs in: (1) a large artesian aquifer, (2) a deep unconfined aquifer, (3) a shallow unconfined aquifer overlying the (artesian) confined aquifer, and (4) in local, perched unconfined aquifers. All are hydraulically interconnected to some extent, but the large artesian aquifer directly recharges the deep artesian aquifer. The shallow unconfined aquifer overlies the confining layer for the artesian aquifer while the locally perched aquifers are in areas overlying the deep unconfined reservoir. This confining layer generally consists of clay, silt, and fine sand, lying between 15 and 46 meters (50 and 150 feet) below the surface (Hely and others, 1971). The shallow, unconfined aquifer extends over the same area as the confined aquifer while the perched aquifers are found primarily east of Midvale and west of Riverton overlying the deep unconfined aquifer (figure 5).

Principal Aquifer

The deep unconfined aquifer in the Jordan Valley is a principal recharge source for the artesian aquifer. The line dividing these two aquifers can only be approximately located due to shifts caused by response to changing rates of recharge and discharge (Hely and others, 1971) (figure 5).

The artesian aquifer consists of quaternary deposits of interbedded clay, silt, sand, and gravel, all hydraulically interconnected; thin beds and lenses of fine-grained material up to 20 feet thick tend to confine water in each of the many individual beds of sand and gravel. The fine-grained material is slightly to moderately permeable and discontinuous, thereby allowing movement of water between the various permeable beds of sand and gravel (Hely and others, 1971). This confined aquifer contains a maximum thickness of more than 305 meters (1000 feet) in the northern part of the valley (Hely and others, 1971). For the most part, this aquifer is underlain by Tertiary and pre-Tertiary deposits. In some areas, the Tertiary deposits are permeable enough to yield water to wells (Hely and others, 1971).

Recharge and Movement

Recharge to the Jordan Valley ground water system comes from the following sources: (1) seepage from bedrock fractures in the adjoining mountains, (2) underflow in channel fill draining the adjacent canyons, (3) underflow from Utah Valley to the south through the Jordan Narrows and Ogden Valley to the northwest of the Salt Lake salient, (4) seepage from creek channels and the Jordan River, (5) seepage from unlined canals, (6) migration upward through fault systems, (7) direct precipitation, (8) seepage from irrigation, and (9) seepage from tailings ponds.

Groundwater movement in the principal aquifer is generally northward toward the Great Salt Lake. Groundwater migrates laterally toward the Jordan River from both the east and west sides of the valley and subsequently migrates to the north (figure 5).
Figure 5. Approximate areas in which ground water occurs in confined, shallow unconfined, deep unconfined, and perched aquifers in Jordan Valley (from Hely and others, 1971)
An attempt was made to measure/sample wells that intercepted the principal aquifer. Where no wells of this type were available or accessible, shallower wells were used although these are few in number. Temperatures were recorded at 214 locations by Utah Geological and Mineral Survey (UGMS) personnel, an additional 9 temperatures were obtained from local municipal water departments, and 15 temperatures were provided by the Kennecott Copper Corporation. Of the 214 locations measured by UGMS, 5 were springs and the balance consisted of pumped or flowing wells.

Temperatures, both measured and acquired, range from 7.5°C to 85°C; 182 of the 238 total measured range from 10.4°C to 17.4°C. These temperatures are slightly higher than those of Marine and Price (1964) who found most temperatures between 7.8°C and 59.4°C. This result is not unexpected since this study was designed to define potential geothermal areas and much data was collected in areas thought to be of above average temperature. Also, test wells have been drilled at Crystal Hot Springs, intercepting warmer water at depth, thereby increasing the upper limit to 85°C from the 59.4°C that had previously been measured in the surface ponds at this location.

Areas of Warm Water

Seventy-six percent (182 out of 238) of all temperatures measured or acquired in the Jordan Valley were 17.4°C or lower. For this reason, 18.0°C was designated as the low temperature limit in trying to delineate anomalously warm areas for further investigation. The result indicates six general areas of potential low temperature geothermal water in addition to a few isolated wells. These general areas are: (1) the northcentral valley area, (2) the area immediately north of the Oquirrh Mountains, (3) the Warm Springs fault geothermal area, (4) an east-west section of the central valley in the vicinity of Kearns, Murray and Holladay, (5) an area between Sandy City and Draper in the southeastern part of the valley, and (6) an area in the extreme southern part of the valley, including Crystal Hot Springs. These areas are presented in Plate III.

Northcentral Valley Area

Temperatures in this vicinity range from 19.3°C to 28.1°C and are spread over a fan-shaped area covering approximately 85 square kilometers (33 sw. mi.). First indications from gravity surveys suggest this area is bordered by faulting which could, in turn, structurally control the location of warm water encountered in wells. If this is occurring, groundwater must be circulating to a minimum depth of 0.5 kilometers (0.3 miles) for the Basin and Range geothermal gradient to heat the water to the temperature recorded at the well heads. Marine and Price (1964) suggest an alternative theory of ground water reactions with the organic clays in the area, with the resulting temperature being a product of exothermic reactions.

North Oquirrh Area

This area, located immediately north of the Oquirrh Mountains, ranged in temperature from 21°C to 29°C (Plate III). A possible source of this anomaly could be water circulating at depth and migrating up the Pony Express and Rio Grande thrust faults. The minimum depth of circulation is estimated to be 0.5 kilometers (0.3 miles).

Warm Springs Fault Area

The Warm Spung Fault geothermal system is located immediately west of the Salt Lake salient (Plate III). According to Murphy and Gwynn (1979) this system is controlled by water circulating to a minimum depth of 1.5 to 2.0 kilometers (0.9 to 1.2 miles) and migrating up the Warm Springs and Hobo fault systems. They indicate that the major springs tend to occur at the intersections of these major faults with older, minor structures striking roughly perpendicular. An anomalously warm well (19.4°C) is located approximately 1.6 kilometers (1 mile) south of the Warm Springs fault. This anomaly could result from a continuation of the Warm Springs or Hobo fault systems to the south.

Central Valley Area

A temperature of 18.8°C was recorded approximately 3.2 kilometers (2 miles) north of Kearns while two warm temperatures (18.5°C and 21.0°C) were recorded approximately 2.4 kilometers (1.5 miles) to the southwest. The warm
temperature recorded to the north could be controlled by the Jordan Valley fault zone. The two wells to the southwest were drilled to depths of between 305 and 335 meters (1000 to 1100 feet) in an area where wells are known to be receiving water from permeable zones in Tertiary deposits. These wells were drilled to a significantly greater depth than other, cooler wells in the area therefore indicating that the normal geothermal gradient may be producing these anomalously warm temperatures.

A second group of warm temperatures were measured in wells located in the Murray area (Plate III). Six wells produced temperatures ranging from 18° to 21°C.

Two wells with temperatures of 23.8° and 22.1°C are located in the Holladay area (Plate III). This anomaly may be attributable to warm water rising from depths of at least 0.5 kilometers (0.3 miles) along the East Bench fault.

Sandy City -- Draper Area

Warm water was encountered in 9 wells located in the general area between Sandy City and Draper, Utah (Plate III). Six of these wells are located south of Sandy City and trend in a west-northwest direction with temperatures ranging from 18.0° to 48°C. The anomalous temperatures in two of these wells can be attributed to the normal thermal gradient.

Three other warm wells are located randomly in and northwest of Draper (Plate III). These wells produce water with temperatures of 19.2°, 21.7° and 23.7°C. Insufficient data is available at this time to speculate as to the source of this water.

Crystal Hot Springs Area

Five warm temperatures ranging from 28.5° to 85.0°C were measured at and in the vicinity of Crystal Hot Springs. Murphy and Gwynn (1979) and Murphy (1981) studied this area extensively and conclude that it is located between two range front faults, is underlain by smaller fault blocks and is supplied by warm water circulating to a minimum depth of 2.5 kilometers (1.55 miles). This water is heated by the normal geothermal gradient and rises along permeable fault zones and infiltrates into well-fractured quartzite located beneath the site.

Other Isolated Warm Temperatures

A temperature of 23.5°C was measured approximately 2.4 kilometers (1.5 miles) north of Sandy City. This temperature cannot be accounted for by the normal Basin and Range geothermal gradient and does not seem to be related to other anomalous temperatures in the area.

Three other anomalous temperatures were measured in the southwest part of the valley (Plate III). Locations of these wells were approximately 3.2 kilometers (2 miles) southeast of Crystal Hot Springs, just east of Herriman and in Rose Canyon (Plate III). The 18.6°C temperature recorded southwest of Crystal Hot Springs and the 21.0°C temperature measured in Rose Canyon can be accounted for by the normal geothermal gradient. At this time no explanation is available for the 19.0°C temperature recorded east of Herriman.

Chemistry

The Jordan Valley exhibits a complex ground water chemistry which is attributable to complicated stratigraphy and structure as well as low temperature geothermal activity within the area. Despite this inherent complexity, however, trends are apparent in this system which are indicative of anomalous chemistry that may be associated with geothermal activity.

A definite trend in the ground water seems evident from the Jordan Narrows north to Sandy City (Plate IV). Generally, the water in this area contains approximately equal amounts of sodium, calcium and magnesium cations with predominantly sulfate and chloride anions.

Four isolated locations are indicative of ground water high in sodium and chloride (Plate V). Three of these locations are in the area where Corner Creek, Little Cottonwood Creek and Big Cottonwood Creek plumes should predomi-
nate. However, due to the fairly deep graben present in this area (Everitt, 1979), the groundwater is thought to circulate quite deep, increasing in temperature and dissolution time and consequently accumulating predominantly sodium and chloride ions. The fourth location is on the edge of this basin but exhibits similar chemistry. This could be caused by the deep circulation of geothermal groundwater through a highly faulted area (Murphy and Gwynn, 1979).

The central part of the Jordan Valley displays chemistry typical of groundwater in a resistate system. The groundwater contains approximately equal amounts of sodium, calcium and magnesium cations with predominantly sulfate and chloride anions (Plate IV). Total dissolved solids are greater than 1600 ppm (Plate V). These chemical conditions may be the result of the structural conditions within this portion of the valley; a possible explanation is as follows: The “Complete Bouguer Gravity Map” (Plate II) suggests this area is structurally complex. Plate II indicates that an east-west striking normal fault down-dropped on the south is present, extending east from Bacchus approximately 6.4 kilometers (4 miles). This fault is truncated by a north-south oriented fault, down-dropped on the east, which extends northward through the valley (Plate II). The increase in bedrock elevation to the north through this part of the Jordan Valley causes a decrease in the rate of groundwater migration and an increase in time of dissolution. East of Bacchus, the groundwater could be interacting with geothermal water migrating upward from depth along the fault system, thereby increasing in total dissolved solids.

Further north, a sharp transitional boundary exists, where the groundwater changes to a predominantly sodium chloride system (Plate IV). This transition zone roughly parallels the stratigraphic change from the pediment located in the West Slope groundwater district to the Lake Bonneville clays of the Northwest Lake Plain groundwater district. The change in chemistry reflects the influence of the Great Salt Lake and the ion exchange capacity of the lake clays located in this area.

The chemistry of the groundwater in the north-central part of the valley is predominantly a sodium chloride system, but displays a significant increase in bicarbonate while exhibiting a decrease in calcium, magnesium, sulfate and total dissolved solids (Plates IV and V). Plate II indicates this area is a horst bounded by grabens to the north, south and west. A seismic reflection survey conducted by the U.S.G.S. also shows this area to be a bedrock high (Mower, 1968). According to Hely and others (1971), the low - total dissolved solids is caused by the migration of high quality water from the Ogden Valley to the north. The significance of the chemistry in relation to the warm water measured in this area is not understood at this time.

The area east of the Jordan River, extending from the Salt Lake salient south to Corner Canyon is recharged by high quality water from the canyons in the Wasatch Range. This results in low total dissolved solids and no significant anomalous water chemistry (Plates IV and V). This high quality water could mask any obvious chemical indication of possible geothermal activity in this area of the valley. The temperature map, however, does indicate warm temperatures both east and west of Murray (Plate III).

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Prior to the study of area-wide, low-temperature geothermal resources in the Jordan Valley, Murphy and Gwynn (1979) conducted studies of two known geothermal areas: (1) the Warm Springs fault, and (2) Crystal Hot Springs. These studies indicate meteoric water is being circulated to depth and heated by the ambient temperature derived from normal heat flow. This warm water migrates upward along permeable fault zones. Study of these two geothermal areas has proven important to the present investigation by providing insight into the controlling mechanism of low-temperature geothermal resources.

The present study being conducted in the Jordan Valley has provided a complete Bouguer gravity map in addition to water temperature and chemistry for 238 wells and springs (Plates II, III, IV, and V). Results of the gravity survey indicate a number of fault blocks are buried beneath valley sediments (Plate II). Since previous work has indicated that warm water migrates upward along permeable fault zones, the common borders of these horsts and grabens could provide conduits for warm water.

Water temperatures measured in the valley have provided further insight into areas of geothermal potential (Plate III). Four areas, in addition to the two known geothermal sites have warm water wells. These areas are designated as the: (1) Northcentral Valley area, (2) North Oquirrh area, (3) Central Valley area, and (4) Sandy City - Draper area.
The chemistry of the Jordan Valley is quite complex and not fully understood in regard to geothermal potential. Further investigation is required to discern the significance of the anomalies noted.

The two known geothermal areas are located where bedrock is within 305 meters (1000 feet) of the surface. In other areas of the valley, bedrock is covered by hundreds of meters (thousands of feet) of unconsolidated sediment which could conceal warm water anomalies due to lateral dispersion or dilution within the principal aquifer. Areas of low permeability could retard warm water flow, thereby allowing for cooling of the water prior to discharge in wells or springs. The area of the valley east of the Jordan River receives considerable cool, high quality ground water recharge from snow melt in the Wasatch Range. This water could appreciably cool possible warm water as well as notably improve the water quality of geothermal resources in that area.

FUTURE INVESTIGATIONS

Jordan Valley geothermal assessment has provided insight into the direction of future investigations to complete the study. The following is additional work to be undertaken within the following year:

1. Gravity modeling to define the structure and geology in specific areas indicative of geothermal potential.
2. Testing of geothermometry models to determine possible reservoir temperatures in areas with warm water wells.
3. Gradient logging where accessible throughout the valley.
4. Further investigation of the chemistry to determine, if possible, correlations between warm water and ion concentrations or types.
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A Geothermal Exploration Philosophy for Mount St. Helens (and other Cascade Volcanoes?)
by
J. Eric Schuster
Washington State Division of Geology and Earth Resources
Olympia, WA 98504
April, 1981

Introduction

The most promising geothermal targets in the Cascade Range are the young stratovolcanoes. The five stratovolcanoes in Washington are reported to support fumaroles near their summits, and there are hot springs on or near the flanks of three of the volcanoes. Geologic studies have demonstrated the extreme youth of volcanic deposits produced by each of these volcanic systems, and there are records of historic eruptions on three of the peaks.

However, the most impressive demonstration of the energy potential of these volcanic systems is the 1980 series of eruptions of Mount St. Helens. The total energy released by this series of eruptions has been estimated at $2.0 \times 10^{25}$ ergs, 90 percent of which was released in the cataclysmic eruption of May 18. The equivalent electrical energy is about 63,000 megawatt years, or roughly 100 years of power generation at The Geysers.

Tremendous energy sources probably exist beneath Cascade stratovolcanoes, even during periods between eruptions, but exploration has been hampered and slowed by a number of factors:

1. Several of the stratovolcanoes are included within Wilderness Areas or National Parks. This precludes or severely limits possibilities for exploration and development of geothermal resources on and near these volcanoes.
2. Most of the stratovolcanoes are highly regarded for their scenic and recreational values. These values conflict or seem to conflict with the perception of geothermal development as an industrial activity.
3. Geothermal exploration and development on a stratovolcano presents a number of difficult logistical problems.
4. Most Cascade stratovolcanoes lack robust surface manifestations of geothermal systems. Some investigators believe this is due to cooling and dilution by a "cold water blanket" which results from the heavy precipitation received by many parts of the Cascade Range. As a result, specific targets are lacking.
5. Secondary minerals resulting from hydrothermal alteration apparently seal many of the older fault and fracture zones. Even when moderately deep drill holes penetrate these zones and temperatures are encouraging, there may be no significant water flow from the hole.

6. There has been very little geothermal leasing of federal lands in the Cascades.

Progress toward exploration and development of geothermal resources near Cascade stratovolcanoes can be made if some of these problems can be avoided. Exploration for geothermal resources near stratovolcanoes must obviously take place in close enough proximity to the volcano to take advantage of the heat source that the volcano represents. At the same time, in order to proceed and be cost-effective, exploration must take place outside of National Parks and Wilderness Areas, outside of the areas where scenic and recreational values are so high, and away from the logistical problems presented by the peaks themselves. Furthermore, exploration probably should not depend heavily on surface manifestations as a means for locating targets. Active faults should be sought where hydrothermal alteration has not had time to precipitate secondary minerals to seal the system.

Recent experience at Mount St. Helens suggests that it may be possible to develop an exploration philosophy which incorporates many of these attributes. First, it is necessary to review what was known about geothermal energy in the Mount St. Helens area prior to 1980, and what has been learned as a result of the 1980 eruptions.

Mount St. Helens Prior to 1980

Prior to 1980 the geologic record of Mount St. Helens indicated a history of eruptions stretching back nearly 36,000 years. Historic records confirmed eruptions between 1832 and 1857. Mount St. Helens was believed to be the Cascade volcano most likely to erupt explosively.

A seismic network had been operated in western Washington by the University of Washington for nearly a decade. Plots of about 20 earthquake epicenters' recorded in the Mount St. Helens area prior to 1980 suggested the presence of a structure (fault or fault zone?) trending to the north-northwest from the mountain. Little was known about the nature of this structure or its relationship to volcanism at Mount St. Helens.
One mineral spring was known to exist along the trend of this structure; one shallow heat-flow hole drilled along this trend at a distance of 8 km from the volcano showed no anomalous temperatures; small fumaroles near the summit fell on or near the NNW trending structure. Young volcanic features were known to occur to the SSE of Mount St. Helens, including Marble Mountain, Soda Peaks, West Crater, and Trout Creek Hill volcano, but only Marble Mountain is located 15 km or less from the stratovolcano.

Mount St. Helens, 1980

During the 1980 eruptions, the relative seismic quiescence changed dramatically. Seismic evidence for a major active fault trending NNW-SSE through Mount St. Helens, and a lesser fault trending NE-SW and intersecting the major trend beneath the volcano, has become very convincing. Thousands of earthquakes, up to a Richter magnitude of 5.5, have occurred. A significant number of these earthquakes have occurred along the NNW-SSE trending fault at distances up to 30 km from the volcano and at depths as shallow as 5 km or less.

The 1980 volcanism has not generated new hot springs or other surface manifestations except for those related to the central vent and the hot pyroclastic deposits filling the valley to the north. Neither have changes been observed in the cold springs surrounding the base of the mountain, nor in the temperatures of two remaining heat-flow holes near the mountain (a third hole, mentioned above, was destroyed by the May 18 Toutle River debris flow). The "cold water blanket" over the Mount St. Helens area appears, then, to have thus far remained unaffected by the eruptions, except for the area near the central vent.

Exploration Philosophy

The 1980 seismicity and the interpretations which are beginning to grow out of the recent studies of Mount St. Helens may be the key to developing a philosophy for geothermal exploration around Mount St. Helens, and perhaps other Cascade stratovolcanoes as well.

The seismic activity can be interpreted as follows:

1. An active fault zone which is intimately related to volcanic activity extends through Mount St. Helens.
2. The fact that the fault zone is active means that permeabilities along it are good, allowing for fluid movement.
3. Hypocenter depths are, at least in part, within reach of a deep drill hole.

4. Fluids migrating along the fault zone may be hot water or even magma.

5. The fault zone extends beyond Mount St. Helens far enough so that exploration may be able to avoid the serious logistical and environmental problems associated with the mountain.

In the case of Mount St. Helens, geothermal exploration should first concentrate on the development of a better seismic velocity model. This will allow more precise calculation of earthquake hypocenter locations and, therefore, more precise definition of the width, trend, dip and mechanics of the NNW-SSE trending fault zone. This will require shot-hole refraction seismic work. An additional objective of shot-hole work would be to test for the presence, shape, size, and depth of a magma chamber beneath Mount St. Helens.

Seismic work might be supplemented by additional geologic, geochemical, or geophysical work focused toward determining the nature of the fault zone and whether heated fluids are, indeed, present. Further study will be required to determine which additional studies would be most appropriate.

Once the fault zone has been defined as well as practical by surface methods, the zone should be explored by deep drilling.

Depending heavily on a single method of investigation (in this case seismic studies) to locate geothermal targets for deep drilling is certainly not standard practice. However, because of the 1980-81 eruptions Mount St. Helens cannot be seriously questioned as a source of heat, the NNW-SSE trending fault zone is almost certainly real and is quite probably a zone of permeability, and other exploration methods around Cascade stratovolcanoes have either been difficult to interpret or have failed to penetrate the "cold water blanket". Deep drilling based on the best available seismic data and interpretations is logical at Mount St. Helens.

At other Cascade stratovolcanoes existing seismic data should be analyzed for structural trends and these trends investigated. If seismic data are poor or lacking, long-term seismic monitoring networks should be set up.
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CONDUCTIVE THERMAL MODELING OF WYOMING
GEOTHERMAL SYSTEMS
by
Henry P. Heasler
Department of Geology and Geophysics
University of Wyoming
Laramie, Wyoming

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to present a summary of techniques used by the Wyoming Geothermal Resource Assessment Group in defining low-temperature hydrothermal resource areas. Emphasis will be placed on thermal modeling techniques appropriate to Wyoming's geologic setting. Thermal parameters discussed include oil-well bottom hole temperatures, heat flow, thermal conductivity, and measured temperature-depth profiles. Examples of the use of these techniques will be from the regional study of the Bighorn Basin and two site specific studies within the Basin. Funding for this work has been primarily from the U.S. Department of Energy Cooperative Agreement DE-FC07-791D12026.

General Geologic Setting

Wyoming is in the Rocky Mountain and Great Plains physiographic provinces (Fenneman, 1946). This region, often referred to as the Rocky Mountain Foreland, is primarily situated between geosynclines to the west and the stable craton to the east. Much of Wyoming is essentially a group of large intermontane basins separated by major mountain ranges or arches (Figure 1). For most of the region the present distribution of mountains and basins resulted from the Laramide orogeny beginning in the Late Cretaceous (approximately 70 million years ago) and terminating in the middle to late Eocene (approximately 40 million years ago). The tectonic style of Wyoming is characterized by compression, uplift and thrust faulting (Blackstone, 1971; Houston, 1969).

The major mountain uplifts expose rocks of Precambrian age while the basins contain sediments of Paleozoic, Mesozoic and Cenozoic age. Some of the Paleozoic and Mesozoic sediments are porous and permeable forming aquifers that exist over entire basins. The Laramide deformation of these has resulted in a structural relief of many kilometers in the
basins. For example, portions of the Bighorn Basin have a structural relief of over 9 kilometers (Prucha et al., 1965). Also, due to the physical properties and deformation of the sediments, a great amount of hydrocarbon exploration has taken place in Wyoming.

There has been volcanic activity in Wyoming in Yellowstone National Park as recent as the Pliestocene (Love et al., 1972), in the Absaroka Mountains in the middle Eocene (Smedes and Prostka, 1972), in the Rattlesnake Hills in central Wyoming in the middle Eocene (Pekarek, 1974) and in the Black Hills in the middle Eocene (Houston, 1963). Preliminary geothermal studies by our group have not identified any geothermal resources near the Eocene age volcanics.

Thermal Techniques

A major portion of the geothermal assessment of Wyoming has been the compilation and depiction of existing bottom hole temperatures from oil and gas wells. The largest problem with using such data is assessing its reliability. The problem of the thermal equilibration of a well after drilling has been discussed by Lachenbruch and Brewer (1959), and the problem of thermal instability of a large diameter drillhole is addressed by Diment (1967). However, with oil and gas well data many of the correction factors for thermal equilibrium and stability are unknown and consequently the bottom hole temperatures cannot be absolutely corrected for various thermal perturbations.

Our attempt at solving this problem has been to define anomalous points within the oil well bottom hole temperature data set. Many parameters must be considered in the definition of anomalous points. First, the data are analyzed only for areas of similar geology. Parameters considered here are the character of aquifers present, lateral extent and continuity of formations, oil and gas producing units, tectonic style, and actual rock types present. By analyzing the data within a similar geological area we are attempting to eliminate the variability in the data that would be due to differences in crustal heat flow and thermal properties of vastly different rock units.

After the data is gathered for an area, a series of computer plots are made showing temperature versus depth, thermal gradient versus depth,
and temperature versus thermal gradient. The effect of average and maximum mud temperatures on the thermal gradient for the region is then plotted with the thermal gradient versus depth data. (see Figure 2). From these plots, data with anomalously high thermal gradients can be identified and located on a map. If these data points cluster in an area, we feel confident of the anomaly and study the anomalous areas in greater detail. Also, from the bottom hole temperature data set maps are compiled of the thermal gradient and the major aquifer temperatures.

To further assess the reliability of the oil well bottom hole temperatures considerable effort is expended measuring temperatures in drill holes. Basically, temperatures are measured with a thermistor probe and wheatstone bridge combination at 5 to 10 meter intervals down the wells. Decker (1973) gives a complete description of equipment used and assesses the errors involved. Least squares gradient computations for linear segments of the temperature versus depth plots and absolute measured temperatures are then compared with the gradients and temperatures from the oil well bottom hole temperature data set. To date what has been found is that the oil well bottom hole temperatures and gradients for holes generally deeper than 750 meters (2500 feet) have always been less than or equal to the measured temperatures and gradients. Above this depth the effect of warm drilling fluids raising the equilibrium temperature must be considered. However, since most of the oil data is below 750 meters (2500 feet), this method of bottom hole temperature analysis generally results in gradient and temperature values less than equilibrium values.

As previously mentioned, a great amount of effort is expended on thermally measuring drill holes. This serves three main purposes. First it is important in the determination of the reliability of the oil and gas temperature data. Second, the resulting temperature-depth profiles show the change of gradient within differing rock units and with depth. Finally, thermally measured holes when combined with rock thermal conductivity can be used to estimate the heat flow for an area. Both of these last two uses of thermally measured holes are critical to the modeling of hydrothermal systems found in the basins of Wyoming.

Most of the hydrothermal systems in Wyoming's basins function in a similar way. Water enters aquifers in the surrounding mountains, flows
down the continuous dip slopes to where it becomes heated in a syncline, and is then forced back to the surface or near surface in anticlines. Critical parameters that need to be defined for potential developers of such systems are the maximum temperature of the system, depth to the hydrothermal reservoir, and extent of the reservoir. Conductive thermal modeling is one approach to answering these questions.

The purpose of a conductive thermal model is to calculate the temperature of aquifers in the synclinal portion of these hydrothermal systems. By modeling the temperatures in the aquifers a judgement can be made as to whether the observed thermal anomaly can be explained by the regional heat flow, thermal conductivity of the rocks, depth of the syncline, and water flow direction within the aquifers. If the model fits the thermal anomaly then the critical parameters of maximum temperature, depth to the reservoir, and extent may be predicted with some certainty.

The conductive thermal modeling of an area begins with an understanding of stratigraphy, structural geology, and hydrology. These are parameters which set limits on the thermal conductivity, thermal gradient, and depth to aquifers. Next, a regional heat flow value is determined using published values and new values calculated as a result of our thermal investigations. Since a necessary part of the heat flow determinations is the measurement of rock thermal conductivities, this conductivity data will already exist for use in the thermal model. To model the temperature at a given depth in the syncline one uses the equation:

\[ T_a = T_s + [(Q/K_1) \cdot dx_1 + (Q/K_2 \cdot dx_2) + \ldots] \]

where \( T_a \) is the sought after temperature in the aquifer, \( T_s \) is the mean surface temperature, \( Q \) is the regional heat flow, \( K_1 \) and \( dx_1 \) are the thermal conductivity and thickness of lithologic unit closest the ground surface, \( K_2 \) and \( dx_2 \) are the thermal conductivity and thickness of the lithologic unit below unit 1, and so on until the aquifer is reached.

Other thermal parameters may also be usefully modeled. For example, the flow of a hot artesian well or spring may be modeled in an attempt to assess how much the temperature is decreased in flowing from the hydrothermal reservoir to the surface (see Truesdell et al., 1977). This is useful in helping to define the maximum temperature of the hydrothermal reservoir. Another useful parameter to model in the syncline-anticline
The hydrothermal system is the total conductive heat gain and the heat loss of the system. By using the regional heat flow, and the flow and temperature of hot wells and springs a minimum area can be calculated over which the water must flow to attain the needed heat. This calculation will not prove the conductive syncline-anticline thermal model is correct but can help illustrate inconsistencies in the model if the area needed for heat gain is much larger than that available.

Application and Results

The methods discussed have been applied with success to the Bighorn Basin in northwestern Wyoming. Over 1,900 oil well bottom hole temperature points were used in the analysis of anomalously high thermal gradient areas. Gradient-depth data were plotted along with curves representing a gradient resulting from the effect of isothermal drilling mud (Figure 2). This aided in defining areas of anomalously warm fluids (40-70°C (104-158°F)) at shallow depths (150-750 meters (500-2,500 feet)). Based on the data a thermal gradient contour map was compiled and anomalous areas identified near the towns of Cody, Thermopolis, and Greybull (Figure 3). Gradients in these areas were in excess of 90°C/km (50°F/1000 ft).

The Cody and Thermopolis areas were thermally modeled using the described techniques. Heat flow and thermal conductivities were primarily from Decker et al. (1980) and new values determined during the course of this study. Geologic constraints for the modeling resulted from an analysis of existing geologic literature, limited field mapping and an analysis of existing hydrologic data. An important contribution to the thermal model was the actual measurement of temperatures down drill holes in the thermal areas. Twenty four wells were thermally logged near the resource areas. These wells not only resulted in accurate temperature and gradient data but helped define the intermixing of fluids within some aquifers by their isothermal character (Figure 4).

An example of a map presenting geologic and oil well thermal data is shown for the Cody area in Figure 5. The results of thermal studies including a DOE sponsored drilling program in the Cody area defines the area of greatest use to be in T.52N., R.102W., sections 2, 3, 11, and 16. In this area warm waters (34°C (93°F)) can be reached at shallow depths (51 to 300 meters (168 to 1,000 feet)). The maximum temperature of this system
may approach 55 to 65°C (131 to 149°F) at depths of 260 to 500 meters (853 to 1640 feet). Warm waters will be found at the shallower depths in the more western portions of this potential use area (see Heasler and Decker, 1980).

Thermal modeling of the Thermopolis low temperature resource area predicts maximum temperatures in the Madison aquifer of 77°C (170°F) northwest of the Thermopolis townsite and 60°C (140°F) in the vicinity of the townsite. Observed temperatures in this area agree well with the model as can be observed from the temperature-depth plot in Figure 4 which has a measured maximum temperature of 71°C (161°F). Depths to the hydrothermal fluid along the Thermopolis anticline vary between 150 to 300 meters (500 to 1000 feet) (see Hinckley et al., 1981).

Conclusion

The use of oil and gas well temperature data and conductive thermal modeling have been shown to be useful techniques in defining low temperature hydrothermal systems in Wyoming. The oil and gas well data are used in locating areas of high thermal gradients by considering the effects of drilling mud temperature, rock thermal conductivities, surface temperature, and drilling duration; and by comparing oil and gas well thermal gradients to gradients computed from measured temperature-depth data. Conductive thermal modeling is accomplished by using regional heat flow data, rock thermal conductivity information, measuring thermal profiles of wells, and applying geologic constraints to the model. Parameters that have been successfully addressed by this method of thermal modeling are the maximum temperature of the hydrothermal systems, extend, and depth to hydrothermal reservoirs.
Figure 1. Generalized geology of Wyoming showing major structural basins.
Figure 2. Oil well temperature data from the Bighorn Basin. The solid line represents a gradient assuming an isothermal drilling mud temperature. Pluses (+) represent more than one data point at that depth and gradient.
Figure 3. Thermal gradient contour map of the Bighorn Basin. Contours are in °F/1000 feet.
Figure 4. Temperature-depth plot for a well on the Thermopolis anticline showing an isothermal character and implied mixing zone within the Park City Formation.
Figure 5. Geologic and thermal data for the Cody area.
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