VALENTINE GOLD PROJECT: AMENDMENT TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

August 2021

# APPENDIX D SUMMARY OF PACKER TESTING, 2020 FS-LEVEL GEOTECHNICAL PIT DESIGN PROGRAM



May 31, 2021

File: 80047.03 - REV0

Marathon Gold Corporation 10 King Street East, Suite 501 Toronto, ON M5C 1C3

Attention: Mr. James Powell, M.Eng. P.Eng. Vice President, Regulatory and Government Affairs

Re: Summary of Packer Testing, 2020 FS-Level Geotechnical Pit Design Program, Marathon Valentine Gold Project, Central Newfoundland

This letter report was prepared by GEMTEC Consulting Engineers and Scientists Limited (GEMTEC) and summarizes the packer testing program completed as part of the 2020 Feasibility Study (FS)-Level Geotechnical Pit Design Program completed for the Marathon Valentine Gold Project Site, as documented in Terrane (2021). This letter report provides a detailed description of the field testing and data analysis methods used for the packer testing program, and presents the estimates of hydraulic conductivity determined through packer testing for the various lithologies and structural features (e.g. faults, fractures, shear zones) identified in the proposed Marathon and Leprechaun pit areas.

# 2020 PACKER TESTING PROGRAM

### Packer Testing Methods

Packer testing was carried out concurrently with the 2020 geotechnical drilling program in the proposed Marathon and Leprechaun pit areas. Nine of the 13 geotechnical drill holes completed as part of the 2020 field program were packer tested. The locations of these are shown on the drill hole plans for each proposed pit (attached), and included:

- Five drill holes at Marathon (MA-GT-20-01, MA-GT-20-02, MA-GT-20-03, MA-GT-20-04, and MA-GT-20-06); and,
- Four drill holes at Leprechaun (VL-GT-20-01, VL-GT-20-02, VL-GT-20-04, VL-GT-20-05).

Of these, three drill holes from each area were packer tested with continuous intervals covering the full drilled depths (MA-GT-20-01, MA-GT-20-03, MA-GT-20-04 at Marathon, and VL-GT-20-01, VL-GT-20-02, and VL-GT-20-05 at Leprechaun). Packer testing in the remaining drill holes was carried out on discrete intervals to characterize specific zones of interest. The packer tests were conducted using a Standard Wireline Packer System (SWiPS) manufactured by Inflatable

Packers International (IPI) and were performed using a constant head (Lugeon) packer injection test method.

Several approaches were used to isolate the desired packer testing interval:

- 1. Single packer testing to isolate a discrete interval as the hole was advanced with the bottom of the test interval bounded by the bottom of the drill hole;
- 2. Cumulative single packer testing performed from the bottom up following completion of the total or a portion of the drilled hole, with the bottom of the test interval bounded by the bottom of the drilled portion of the hole, and with overlapping and increased test interval lengths as the single packer was progressively advanced up the hole; and,
- 3. Double packer testing to isolate a discrete interval in the hole following completion of drilling.

A detailed description of the methods used for packer testing is attached. The packer test results for the Marathon pit area and Leprechaun pit area are provided in Tables 1 and 2 (attached), respectively, along with individual analysis reports for each packer test.

A total of 94 packer tests were completed for this program. Of these, 89 packer tests (95%) were successfully completed and were used for hydraulic conductivity characterization. Five packer tests were not considered reliable and were rejected from the analysis. These tests were rejected either due to:

- 1. Testing issues (i.e., difficulty maintaining constant test pressures; for example, test MA-GT-20-03 PT4); or,
- During cumulative single packer testing, where a relatively higher hydraulic conductivity interval situated below masked the hydraulic conductivity for the desired test interval, returning unrealistic negative hydraulic conductivity values (for example, tests MA-GT-20-03 PT2, VL-GT-220-02 PT11 and PT18, and VL-GT-20-05 PT15).

# Packer Testing Results

The hydraulic conductivity for each test interval was determined based on the analysis of the packer test data using the software AquiferTest® Version 10 (Waterloo Hydrogeologic, Waterloo, ON). Hydraulic conductivity values were derived directly from analysis of the discrete single and double packer test data. Since the cumulative single packer tests involved advancing the packer upwards over a progressively expanding test interval, the determined hydraulic conductivity result required mathematical processing to remove the influence of the over-lapping previously tested portion of the drill hole and to determine a unique hydraulic conductivity value for the discrete test interval. A description of the mathematical method used to process the cumulative single packer test data is attached.



A summary of the calculated hydraulic conductivity values for Marathon and Leprechaun are provided in Table 3 below, and plots of hydraulic conductivity versus depth separated by rock type for each deposit is presented in Figure 1.

	Bock/	Number of	Hydraulic Conductivity (m/s)						
Deposit	Structure Type	Packer Tests	Minimum	Maximum	Geometric Mean				
	Quartz-Eye Porphyry	24	5.80E-09	3.76E-06	1.15E-07				
	Conglomerate	6	5.20E-11	7.85E-10	2.92E-10				
Manathan	Mafic Intrusive	2	5.00E-06	1.67E-05	9.13E-06				
Marathon	Valentine Lake Thrust Fault	5	2.53E-09	6.71E-06	6.96E-08				
	Modelled Faults/Other	6	3.42E-10	1.69E-06	9.25E-08				
	All Rock/Structure Types	43	5.20E-11	1.67E-05	5.57E-08				
	Trondhjemite	29	4.79E-11	1.80E-06	5.69E-08				
	Conglomerate	5	2.84E-10	2.60E-09	1.10E-09				
Leprechaun	Valentine Lake Thrust Fault	1			1.37E-09				
	Modelled Faults / Other	11	8.60E-10	1.69E-06	4.75E-08				
	All Rock/Structure Types	46	4.79E-11	1.80E-06	3.26E-08				

 Table 3 - Summary of Calculated Hydraulic Conductivity Values for Major Rock Types and

 Structures in the proposed Marathon and Leprechaun Pit Areas



(a)



Figure 1 Hydraulic conductivity vs Depth by Rock Type and Structural Feature for (a) Marathon, and (b) Leprechaun deposit.

For the Marathon deposit, a broad range in hydraulic conductivity values were calculated spanning six orders of magnitude from 5.20E-11 m/s to 1.67E-05 m/s, with a geometric mean value for all the packer tests of 5.57E-08 m/s.

The hydraulic conductivity of specific rock types at the Marathon deposit is summarized below:

- The quartz eye porphyry, which is the dominant rock type within the Marathon open pit and represents approximately 55% of all the packer tested intervals, had a geometric mean hydraulic conductivity of 1.17E-07 m/s;
- The conglomerate, which makes up a smaller, but main rock type in the Marathon deposit area had a geometric mean hydraulic conductivity of 2.92E-10 m/s. The conglomerate had the lowest hydraulic conductivity, and was approximately three orders of magnitude less than that determined for the quartz eye porphyry;
- The mafic intrusive, a minor rock type in the Marathon deposit area had the highest hydraulic conductivity with a calculated mean value of 9.13E-06 m/s;
- Tests within the quartz-eye porphyry, were conducted over a wide range of depths (from near surface to full depth) and the resulting range of hydraulic conductivity values spanned three to five orders of magnitude.
- In contrast, the hydraulic conductivity values for both the mafic intrusive and conglomerate are based on a relatively low number of tests over a limited range in depths (i.e., two tests at shallow depths < 50 mbgs for the mafic intrusive, and six tests at deep depths >100 mbgs for the conglomerate). Given the few tests and limited range of testing depth, the hydraulic conductivities determined for these rock types may not be fully representative of their bulk values over the full depth of the proposed open pit. This interpretation is supported by the much higher hydraulic conductivity value for conglomerate (1.93E-06 m/s) for shallow test intervals from 30 50 m during previous investigations, which suggests that the full range of conglomerate hydraulic conductivity values from near surface to full pit depth may span five orders of magnitude; and,
- The hydraulic conductivity for the Valentine Lake thrust fault ranged from 2.53E-09 m/s to 6.71E-06 m/s, with a geometric mean of 6.96E-08 m/s. Similar results were also obtained for the other Marathon deposit faults, which had a combined geometric mean of 9.25E-08 m/s. Overall, the hydraulic conductivities determined for the Marathon deposit faults (including the Valentine Lake thrust fault) were within the range of values for the various rock types, and were not found to be hydraulically distinct from the surrounding rock mass. This means the faults in the proposed open pit are not expected to be substantial preferred pathways for groundwater flow, or constitute problem areas for seepage control.



For the Leprechaun deposit, a broad range in hydraulic conductivity values were determined and spanned five orders of magnitude from 4.79E-11 m/s to 1.80E-06 m/s. The geometric mean for all the packer tests was 3.26E-08 m/s.

The hydraulic conductivity of specific rock types at the Leprechaun deposit is summarized below:

- Trondhjemite is the dominant rock type within the Leprechaun deposit open pit and represents approximately 63% of the packer tested intervals and had a geometric mean hydraulic conductivity of 5.69E-08 m/s;
- The conglomerate, which makes up a smaller, but main rock type in the Leprechaun deposit area, had a geometric mean hydraulic conductivity of 1.10E-09 m/s. This value is approximately one order of magnitude higher than that determined for the conglomerate at Marathon but, like Marathon, represents the lowest hydraulic conductivity rock type around the Leprechaun deposit area, and was approximately three orders of magnitude less than that determined for the trondhjemite;
- A similar depth bias exists for the conglomerate hydraulic conductivity dataset at the Leprechaun deposit as for the Marathon deposit, with the mean hydraulic conductivity for this rock type based on only five packer tests all completed below 150 m depth;
- Only one packer test was completed for the Valentine Lake thrust fault, with a hydraulic conductivity value of 1.37E-09 m/s. This value is approximately one order of magnitude lower than that determined for the Valentine Lake thrust fault at the Marathon deposit. The combined mean for the other Leprechaun deposit faults was higher than that determined for the Valentine Fault by an approximate factor of four, with a geometric mean of 4.75E-08 m/s; and,
- Similar to the Marathon deposit, the hydraulic conductivities determined for the Leprechaun deposit faults (including the Valentine Lake thrust fault) were within the range of values for the various rock types, and were not found to be hydraulically distinct from the surrounding rock mass. Similarly, this means the faults in the proposed open pit are not expected to be substantial preferred pathways for groundwater flow, or constitute problem areas for seepage control.

In general, the 2020 hydraulic conductivity values determined for the Marathon and Leprechaun deposits were in good agreement with previous hydrogeological investigations at the site, and are within the typical range of values for similar intact and fractured rock types. Overall, the results for both deposits indicate a generally low permeability rock mass, with no significantly distinct increase in permeability associated with the tested faults and fault zones.

A similar general trend in the hydraulic conductivity distributions for both the Marathon and Leprechaun deposits is visible from Figure 1 (a and b), with hydraulic conductivities generally decreasing with depth for all rock types, as well as tested faults. The highest hydraulic conductivities were measured in shallow bedrock close to surface, and generally, hydraulic

conductivity results 10<sup>-7</sup> m/s and higher were measured above 150 mbgs. This observed decrease in hydraulic conductivity is attributed to closure of fracture apertures with depth due to lithostatic stress.

# CONCLUSIONS

This summary letter report was prepared by Carolyn Anstey-Moore, M.Sc., M.A.Sc., P.Geo. We trust that this report meets your present requirements. If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact our office at your convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

GEMTEC Consulting Engineers and Scientist Limited

Carolyn Anstey-Moore, M.Sc., M.A.Sc., P.Geo.



### REFERENCES

- Beale, G. and Read, J. 2013. Guidelines for Evaluating Water in Pit Slope Stability, CSIRO Publishing, Melbourne, Australia. 600p.
- Terrane Geoscience Inc. 2021. Feasibility Geotechnical Investigation: Marathon and Leprechaun Deposits. Final Report, March 23, 2021. 414p

# ATTACHMENTS

2020 Geotechnical Drill Hole Plans – Marathon and Leprechaun Packer Testing Methods & Data Analysis Table 1 Summary of Packer Testing – Marathon Pit Table 2 Summary of Packer Testing – Leprechaun Pit Packer Test Analysis Reports



### (Figure taken directly from Terrane, 2021)

Ν

5,356,500

5,356,000

5,355,500



# **PACKER TESTING METHODS & ANALYSIS**

### PACKER TESTING METHODS

A total of 94 packer tests were completed for this program. Of these, 89 packer tests (95%) were successfully completed and were used here for hydraulic conductivity characterization. Several approaches were used to isolate the desired packer test intervals, including:

- 1. Single packer testing to isolate a discrete interval as the hole was advanced with the bottom of the test interval bounded by the bottom of the hole;
- 2. Cumulative single packer testing performed from the bottom up following completion of the total or a portion of the drilled hole, with the bottom of the test interval bounded by the bottom of the drilled section of the hole, and with overlapping and increased test interval lengths as the single packer was progressively advanced up the hole; and,
- 3. Double packer testing to isolate a discrete interval in the hole following completion of drilling.

The packer tests were conducted using a Standard Wireline Packer System (SWiPS) manufactured by Inflatable Packers International (IPI), and were performed using a constant head (Lugeon) packer injection test method.

Single packer tests were conducted as follows:

- A borehole was advanced to the bottom of a chosen test interval and the hole was flushed with clean water through the drill rod until the return water was clear. The water source used for packer testing was obtained from nearby surface water sources, and was pumped into an on-site water tank so use during testing.
- The drill rods were then withdrawn to the desired test depth, and a single-element packer assembly was lowered inside the drill rods to the top of the test interval with the wireline. The packer bladder was then inflated (using pressurized water) to isolate the test interval; the bottom of which was bounded by the bottom of the drilled section of the borehole. Test intervals were generally 21 m (along hole (AH) in length), corresponding to an approximately 16 m vertical length for the Leprechaun drill holes and an 18 m vertical length for the slightly steeper drill holes at Marathon. For cumulative single packer tests at Marathon and Leprechaun, the test interval was generally expanded by moving the single packer progressively up the hole by these test interval lengths for each sequential test.
- Once a successful seal was established, water was pumped into the isolated test interval through the injection pipe until a constant differential head and inflow rate were established. A total of three ascending and two descending water pressure steps were applied for each interval with regulated constant head achieved by controlling the injection flow rate using a bypass valve.
- For each test step, the water injection rate was observed until it had stabilized (generally up to 10 minutes). During this observation period, the pressure and injected quantity of water was recorded at one-minute intervals. The stabilized flow rate was used to calculate the bulk hydraulic conductivity of the rock mass over the tested interval. Pressure was measured using

# **PACKER TESTING METHODS & ANALYSIS**

a 10 psi or 100 psi gauge, depending on the required test pressures, and the water injection rate was measured using a flow meter totalizer and stopwatch.

Double packer tests were conducted as follows. The test interval was sealed at either end with a hydraulically inflated packer bladder, and water was injected through a section of perforated pipe located between the two packers. The same constant head injection test procedures were applied to the double packer test section as that described above for single packer testing. Double packer test interval lengths varied from 1 m to 24 m vertical length, depending on the length of the zone of interest.

# 2. PACKER TESTING DATA ANALYSIS

The hydraulic conductivity for each test interval was determined based on the analysis of the packer test data using the software AquiferTest® Version 10 (Waterloo Hydrogeologic, Waterloo, ON). Hydraulic conductivity values for single- and double-packer tests were calculated directly from the packer test data. In contrast, since the cumulative single packer tests involved raising the packer assembly upwards over a progressively longer test interval, the calculated hydraulic conductivity result for the test interval required mathematical processing to remove the influence of the over-lapping previously tested portion of the drill hole in order to determine a specific hydraulic conductivity value for the uppermost, incremental part of the overall test interval.

The hydraulic conductivity of the discrete test intervals for the cumulative single packer tests were determined by applying the basic theory of parallel groundwater flow through a layered bedrock system (e.g., Beale and Read, 2013). The total effective hydraulic conductivity ( $K_x$ ) of a layered bedrock system is equal to the summation of the hydraulic conductivities of the individual layers, weighted based on layer thickness, as given by:

$$K_x = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n K_i \, b_i}{\sum_i^n b_i} = \frac{K_1 \, b_1 \, + \, K_2 \, b_2 + \, K_3 \, b_3 \, + \dots + K_n \, b_n}{b_1 \, + \, b_2 \, + \, b_3 \, + \dots + b_n}$$

where

- $K_x$  = total effective hydraulic conductivity of the layered bedrock system (m/s)
- K<sub>i</sub> = hydraulic conductivity of layer (m/s)
- $b_i$  = thickness of layer *i* (m)
- i = number of layer
- n = total number of layers

Applying the layered bedrock system analog to the cumulative single packer tests, each discrete test interval in the cumulative tested section was assumed to be equivalent to a bedrock layer in the above equation with its own unique hydraulic conductivity and thickness (i.e., test length AH).

# **PACKER TESTING METHODS & ANALYSIS**

The figure below illustrates the overlapping sequencing of the cumulative single packer testing carried out as part of the current program and how hydraulic conductively values were derived using the above equation for a layered bedrock system.



Illustration of cumulative single packer testing using parallel groundwater flow through a layered bedrock system analog.

As illustrated above, each cumulative packer test interval was incrementally longer than for the previous test, and encompassed a new upper interval for which a specific hydraulic conductivity value was to be determined. The packer test completed on the lowermost interval (Packer test 1) directly provided the specific hydraulic conductivity value for this first test interval. For the next sequential packer test (Packer test 2), the hydraulic conductivity value for the upper discrete interval (K<sub>2</sub>) was determined by simplifying and rearranging the general layered system hydraulic conductivity equation as follows:

$$K_2 = \frac{K_{x2}(b_1 + b_2) - K_1 b_1}{b_2}$$

In this equation the " $K_{x2}(b_1 + b_2)$ " term represents the hydraulic conductivity packer test result and test length for the entire test interval (i.e., Packer test 2), and the " $K_1 b_1$ " term represents the results for the previous test interval (i.e., Packer test 1). Carrying on with this approach, the hydraulic conductivity value for each subsequent discrete test interval was determined by subtracting the product of the K value and test interval length for the current and previous packer tests and dividing by the length of the uppermost discrete test interval.

#### Table 1 Summary of Packer Testing - Marathon Pit

				Test	nterval (m ID)		Discrete Test Interval							
Borehole ID	Packer Test ID	Packer Test Type	From	То	Test Length	Hydraulic Conductivity (m/sec)	From (m ID)	To (m ID)	From (m VD)	To (m VD)	Average Depth (m VD)	Test Length (m)	Hydraulic Conductivity (m/sec)	Lithology/Structure
MA-GT-20-01	PT17	SPT	27.33	362.00	334.67	7.39E-07	27.33	48.33	20.94	37.02	28.98	16.09	9.48E-07	QEP/MD. Modelled_Fault 6 @ 35 m ID; ~0.07 m zone. Also a number of other narrow (<0.1 m thick) rubble zones in test interval.
MA-GT-20-01	PT16	CSPT	48.33	362.00	313.67	7.25E-07	48.33	69.33	37.02	53.11	45.07	16.09	5.56E-06	QEP/MD
MA-GT-20-01	PT15	CSPT	69.33	362.00	292.67	3.78E-07	69.33	90.33	53.11	69.20	61.15	16.09	5.07E-07	QEP/MD
MA-GT-20-01	PT14	CSPT	90.33	362.00	271.67	3.68E-07	90.33	111.33	69.20	85.28	77.24	16.09	7.62E-07	QEP/MD. Modelled_Fault 12 @ 107 m ID (very subtle in core)
MA-GT-20-01	PT13	CSPT	111.33	362.00	250.67	3.35E-07	111.33	132.33	85.28	101.37	93.33	16.09	5.97E-07	QEP/MD
MA-GT-20-01	PT12	CSPT	132.33	362.00	229.67	3.11E-07	132.33	153.33	101.37	117.46	109.41	16.09	1.69E-06	QEP/MD. Modelled_Fault 3 @ 145 m ID; 10 cm rubble zone.
MA-GT-20-01	PT11	CSPT	153.33	362.00	208.67	1.72E-07	153.33	174.33	117.46	133.54	125.50	16.09	5.92E-07	QEP/MD. A number of 0.1 - 0.2 m thick rubble zones in test interval.
MA-GT-20-01	PT10	CSPT	174.33	362.00	187.67	1.25E-07	174.33	195.33	133.54	149.63	141.59	16.09	9.08E-07	QEP/MD. Modelled_Fault 13 @ 183 m ID (very subtle in core)
MA-GT-20-01	PT9	CSPT	195.33	362.00	166.67	2.64E-08	195.33	216.33	149.63	165.72	157.67	16.09	1.78E-08	QEP/MD
MA-GT-20-01	PT8	CSPT	216.33	362.00	145.67	2.76E-08	216.33	237.33	165.72	181.81	173.76	16.09	2.67E-09	QEP/MD
MA-GT-20-01	PT7	CSPT	237.33	362.00	124.67	3.18E-08	237.33	258.33	181.81	197.89	189.85	16.09	1.16E-08	QEP/MD. Modelled_Fault 4 @ 245 m ID (very subtle in core)
MA-GT-20-01	PT6	CSPT	258.33	362.00	103.67	3.59E-08	258.33	279.33	197.89	213.98	205.94	16.09	5.87E-08	QEP/MD
MA-GT-20-01	PT5	CSPT	279.33	362.00	82.67	3.01E-08	279.33	300.33	213.98	230.07	222.02	16.09	5.45E-08	QEP/MD
MA-GT-20-01	PT4	CSPT	300.33	362.00	61.67	2.18E-08	300.33	321.33	230.07	246.15	238.11	16.09	6.38E-08	Cgl/Phyl. Modelled_Fault 1 (VLFT) @ 308 - 314 m ID.
MA-GT-20-01	PT3	DPT	308.33	312.81	4.48	2.53E-09	308.33	312.81	236.19	239.63	237.91	3.43	2.53E-09	Modelled_Fault 1 (VLFT) @ 308 - 314 m ID; observed in core as multiple rubble and gouge zones.
MA-GT-20-01	PT2	CSPT	321.33	362.00	40.67	9.00E-11	321.33	342.18	246.15	262.13	254.14	15.97	5.20E-11	Cgl
MA-GT-20-01	PT1	CSPT	342.18	362.00	19.82	1.30E-10	342.18	362.00	262.13	277.31	269.72	15.18	1.30E-10	Cgl/MD
MA-GT-20-02	PT1	DPT	186.33	215	28.67	2.17E-08	186.33	215.00	156.27	180.31	168.29	24.04	2.17E-08	MD/QEP. Modelled_Fault 1 (VLFT) with multiple fault/rubble zones with gouge infill (up to 0.8 m thick).
MA-GT-20-03	PT7	CSPT	24.33	170.00	145.67	4.32E-06	24.33	44.00	20.63	37.31	28.97	16.68	1.67E-05	Gab. Modelled Fault_2 @ 48 m; subtle in core. Several narrow (up to 0.05 m) rubble zones within test interval.
MA-GT-20-03	PT6	CSPT	44.00	170.00	126.00	2.39E-06	44.00	66.33	37.31	56.25	46.78	18.94	7.08E-06	Gab/QEP. A number of narrow (<0.15 m) fault and rubble zones within test interval.
MA-GT-20-03	PT5	CSPT	66.33	170.00	103.67	1.38E-06	66.33	108.33	56.25	91.87	74.06	35.62	3.36E-06	QEP/MD. Fault from 66.06 - 66.49 m ( 0.43 m thick); and a number of narrow rubble zones (up to 0.05 m thick) over 18 m from 75.22 to 93.35 m.
MA-GT-20-03	PT4	CSPT	87.33	170.00	82.67	ND	87.33	108.33	74.06	91.87	82.96	17.81	ND	QEP/MD
MA-GT-20-03	PT3	CSPT	108.33	170.00	61.67	3.41E-08	108.33	150.33	91.87	127.49	109.68	35.62	4.88E-08	QEP/MD
MA-GT-20-03	PT2	CSPT	129.33	170.00	40.67	3.26E-10	129.33	150.33	109.68	127.49	118.58	17.81	-	QEP/MD
MA-GT-20-03	PT1	SPT	150.33	170.00	19.67	2.65E-09	150.33	170.00	127.49	144.17	135.83	16.68	2.65E-09	QEP/MD
MA-GT-20-03	PT15	CSPT	158.33	326.00	167.67	1.78E-08	158.33	179.33	134.27	152.08	143.18	17.81	1.47E-08	QEP/MD
MA-GT-20-03	PT14	CSPT	179.33	326.00	146.67	1.82E-08	179.33	199.33	152.08	169.04	160.56	16.96	6.32E-09	QEP. Narrow fault (0.02 m) with gouge infill @ 197.3 m ID.

#### Table 1 Summary of Packer Testing - Marathon Pit - cont.

		Burling		Test I	nterval (m ID)		Discrete Test Interval							
Borehole ID	Packer Test ID	Packer Test Type	From	То	Test Length	Hydraulic Conductivity (m/sec)	From (m ID)	To (m ID)	From (m VD)	To (m VD)	Average Depth (m VD)	Test Length (m)	Hydraulic Conductivity (m/sec)	Lithology/Structure
MA-GT-20-03	PT13	CSPT	199.33	326.00	126.67	2.01E-08	199.33	221.33	169.04	187.70	178.37	18.66	6.18E-08	QEP. Modelled Fault_12 @ 216 m. A number of narrow (<0.13 m) rubble zones over test interval.
MA-GT-20-03	PT12	CSPT	221.33	326.00	104.67	1.13E-08	221.33	242.33	187.70	205.51	196.60	17.81	3.04E-08	QEP/MD. Several narrow fault zones (up to 0.09 m thick) with gouge infill within test interval.
MA-GT-20-03	PT11	CSPT	242.33	326.00	83.67	6.51E-09	242.33	263.33	205.51	223.32	214.41	17.81	1.16E-08	QEP. A 0.03 m rubble zone encountered at 256.9 m ID.
MA-GT-20-03	PT10	CSPT	263.33	326.00	62.67	4.82E-09	263.33	284.33	223.32	241.13	232.22	17.81	3.42E-10	QEP/MD. Modelled Fault_3 @ 266.4 m (0.14 m rubble zone).
MA-GT-20-03	PT9	CSPT	284.33	326.00	41.67	7.08E-09	284.33	305.33	241.13	258.93	250.03	17.81	5.80E-09	QEP/MD. Narrow (0.07 m) fault zone at 289.47m, gouge/broken rock filled.
MA-GT-20-03	PT8	SPT	305.33	326.00	20.67	8.37E-09	305.33	326.00	258.93	276.46	267.70	17.53	8.37E-09	QEP
MA-GT-20-04	PT1	SPT	15.33	35.00	19.67	2.01E-06	15.33	35.00	13.28	30.31	21.79	17.03	2.01E-06	QEP
MA-GT-20-04	PT2	SPT	35.00	56.00	21.00	3.76E-06	35.00	56.00	30.31	48.50	39.40	18.19	3.76E-06	QEP/MD. A ~0.3 m fault zone at 54.65 m ID with iron-stained gouge and rubble.
MA-GT-20-04	PT3	SPT	56.00	77.00	21.00	6.09E-07	56.00	77.00	48.50	66.68	57.59	18.19	6.09E-07	QEP/MD. A number of narrow (<0.11 m thick) rubble zones within test interval.
MA-GT-20-04	PT4	SPT	77.00	98.00	21.00	1.60E-06	77.00	98.00	66.68	84.87	75.78	18.19	1.60E-06	QEP/MD. Modeled_Fault_3 @ 79 m ID; associated with a number of rubble zones (<0.1 m thick) from 80 - 96 m.
MA-GT-20-04	PT5*	SPT	98.00	119.00	21.00	1.33E-05	08.00	140.00	04 07	101.04	103.06	26.27	6 715 06	QEP/Phyl-Cgl (contact). Modelled Fault_1 (VLFT) from 118 to 125.7 m ID with numerous zones of rubble and
MA-GT-20-04	PT6*	SPT	119.00	140.00	21.00	1.44E-07	96.00	140.00	04.07	121.24	103.00	30.37	0.7 TE-00	rubble zones within test interval. PT5/6 K values combined to represent VLFT K.
MA-GT-20-04	PT7	SPT	140.00	161.00	21.00	5.32E-10	140.00	161.00	121.24	139.43	130.34	18.19	5.32E-10	Cgl
MA-GT-20-04	PT8	SPT	161.00	182.00	21.00	7.63E-10	161.00	182.00	139.43	157.62	148.52	18.19	7.63E-10	Cgl
MA-GT-20-04	PT9	SPT	182.00	203.00	21.00	2.87E-10	182.00	203.00	157.62	175.80	166.71	18.19	2.87E-10	Cgl
MA-GT-20-04	PT10	SPT	203.00	224.00	21.00	7.85E-10	203.00	224.00	175.80	193.99	184.90	18.19	7.85E-10	Cgl. Narrow (0.005 m) fault zone at 219.34 m.
MA-GT-20-06	PT2	DPT	23.85	25.10	1.25	5.00E-06	23.85	25.10	21.62	22.75	22.18	1.13	5.00E-06	MD
MA-GT-20-06	PT1	DPT	183.30	197.00	13.70	1.18E-08	183.30	197.00	166.13	178.54	172.33	12.42	1.18E-08	QEP

Notes:

CSPT	Cumulative Single Packer Test	
DPT	Double Packer Test	
SPT	Single Packer Test	
ID	Inclined Depth	
VD	Vertical Depth	
QEP	Quartz Eye Porphyry	
MD	Mafic Dyke	

Cgl Phyl VLFT

Conglomerate Phyllite Valentine Lake Fault

Gab ND Gabbro

\*

Gabolo Not determined; test results not reliable Test results returned a negative K value for discrete interval MA-GT-20-04: PT5 and PT6 spanned the VLFT at the QEP/Phyl-Cgl contact. Hydraulic conductivity (K) values combined to derive represented K for the VLFT.

### Table 2 Summary of Packer Testing - Leprechaun Pit

	Packer	Packer		Test Ir	nterval (m ID)	)		Discrete Test Interval						
Borehole ID	Test ID	Test Type	From	То	Test Length	Hydraulic Conductivity (m/sec)	From (m ID)	To (m ID)	From (m VD)	To (m VD)	Average Depth (m VD)	Test Length (m)	Hydraulic Conductivity (m/sec)	Lithology/Structure
VL-GT-20-01	PT6	CSPT	5.33	125.00	119.67	8.31E-07	5.33	21.33	4.37	17.47	10.92	13.11	2.46E-07	Tnj/MD
VL-GT-20-01	PT5	CSPT	21.33	125.00	103.67	9.21E-07	21.33	42.33	17.47	34.67	26.07	17.20	5.33E-07	Tnj/MD; a number of contact discontinuities
VL-GT-20-01	PT4	CSPT	42.33	125.00	82.67	1.02E-06	42.33	63.33	34.67	51.88	43.28	17.20	6.97E-07	Tnj. A number of rubble zones up to 0.3 m thick within test interval.
VL-GT-20-01	PT3	CSPT	63.33	125.00	61.67	1.13E-06	63.33	84.33	51.88	69.08	60.48	17.20	1.81E-07	Tnj. Two narrow (<0.05 m thick) fault zones (gouge filled) within test interval.
VL-GT-20-01	PT2	CSPT	84.33	125.00	40.67	1.62E-06	84.33	105.33	69.08	86.28	77.68	17.20	1.80E-06	Tnj
VL-GT-20-01	PT1	SPT	105.33	125.00	19.67	1.43E-06	105.33	125.00	86.28	102.39	94.34	16.11	1.43E-06	Tnj
VL-GT-20-01	PT11	CSPT	125.33	230.00	104.67	2.00E-07	125.33	145.33	102.66	119.05	110.86	16.38	1.37E-08	Tnj. Modelled_Fault_2 (very suble in core)
VL-GT-20-01	PT10	CSPT	145.33	230.00	84.67	2.44E-07	145.33	168.33	119.05	137.89	128.47	18.84	1.58E-07	Tnj
VL-GT-20-01	PT9	CSPT	168.33	230.00	61.67	2.76E-07	168.33	189.33	137.89	155.09	146.49	17.20	8.07E-07	Cgl. Modelled_Fault 6 is present within test interval; encountered narrow (0.005 m) fault with clay infill @ 156 m, and 0.02 m brittle shear zone at 181 m.
VL-GT-20-01	PT8	CSPT	189.33	230.00	40.67	1.83E-09	189.33	210.33	155.09	172.29	163.69	17.20	2.60E-09	Cgl
VL-GT-20-01	PT7	SPT	210.33	230.00	19.67	1.01E-09	210.33	230.00	172.29	188.40	180.35	16.11	1.01E-09	Cgl
VL-GT-20-02	PT9	CSPT	8	185.00	177.00	2.31E-07	8	18.33	6.55	15.02	10.78	8.46	4.73E-07	Tnj/MD
VL-GT-20-02	PT8	CSPT	18.33	185.00	166.67	2.16E-07	18.33	39.33	15.02	32.22	23.62	17.20	3.13E-07	Tnj/MD. Modelled_Fault 6 @ 26.8 m ID (0.36 m thick withrubble and gouge infill). Also a number of narrow rubble zones (<0.4 m thick) in test interval.
VL-GT-20-02	PT7	CSPT	39.33	185.00	145.67	2.02E-07	39.33	60.33	32.22	49.42	40.82	17.20	3.58E-08	Tnj/MD. A narrow (0.06 m thick) rubble zone at 52.4 m.
VL-GT-20-02	PT6	CSPT	60.33	185.00	124.67	2.30E-07	60.33	81.33	49.42	66.62	58.02	17.20	3.19E-07	Tnj/MD
VL-GT-20-02	PT5	CSPT	81.33	185.00	103.67	2.12E-07	81.33	102.33	66.62	83.82	75.22	17.20	7.42E-08	Tnj/MD
VL-GT-20-02	PT4	CSPT	102.33	185.00	82.67	2.47E-07	102.33	123.33	83.82	101.03	92.42	17.20	1.27E-07	Tnj
VL-GT-20-02	PT3	CSPT	123.33	185.00	61.67	2.88E-07	123.33	144.33	101.03	118.23	109.63	17.20	3.23E-07	Tnj
VL-GT-20-02	PT2	CSPT	144.33	185.00	40.67	2.70E-07	144.33	164.00	118.23	134.34	126.28	16.11	2.45E-07	Tnj. Narrow fault zone (0.005 m thick) with gouge infill @ 154.3 m ID.
VL-GT-20-02	PT1	SPT	164.00	185.00	21.00	2.93E-07	164.00	185.00	134.34	151.54	142.94	17.20	2.93E-07	Tnj. Modelled_Fault 4 @ 176.2 m ID (0.4 m thick with gouge infill).
VL-GT-20-02	PT18	CSPT	185.00	374.00	189.00	1.03E-09	185.00	207.33	151.54	169.83	160.69	18.29	-	Tnj/MD
VL-GT-20-02	PT17	CSPT	207.33	374.00	166.67	1.45E-09	207.33	228.33	169.83	187.04	178.44	17.20	2.00E-09	Tnj/MD

### Table 2 Summary of Packer Testing - Leprechaun Pit - cont.

	Packer	Packer		Test Ir	nterval (m ID)		Discrete Test Interval							
Borehole ID	Test ID	Test Type	From	То	Test Length	Hydraulic Conductivity (m/sec)	From (m ID)	To (m ID)	From (m VD)	To (m VD)	Average Depth (m VD)	Test Length (m)	Hydraulic Conductivity (m/sec)	Lithology/Structure
VL-GT-20-02	PT16	CSPT	228.33	374.00	145.67	1.37E-09	228.33	249.33	187.04	204.24	195.64	17.20	1.37E-09	Tnj/Cgl. Modelled_Fault 1 (VLFT). Very subtle in core.
VL-GT-20-02	PT15	CSPT	249.33	374.00	124.67	1.37E-09	249.33	270.33	204.24	221.44	212.84	17.20	7.78E-10	Cgl
VL-GT-20-02	PT14	CSPT	270.33	374.00	103.67	1.49E-09	270.33	291.33	221.44	238.64	230.04	17.20	8.60E-10	Cgl. Modelled_Fault 9 @ 274.4 m ID ( 0.03 m zone with gouge infill). Also narrow rubble zone (0.05 m thick) within test interval.
VL-GT-20-02	PT13	CSPT	291.33	374.00	82.67	1.65E-09	291.33	312.33	238.64	255.85	247.24	17.20	1.21E-09	Cgl. Modelled_Fault 10 @ 307.6 m ID (0.11 cm thick with gouge infill). Several other narrow (<0.0005 m thick) fault zones within test interval.
VL-GT-20-02	PT12	CSPT	312.33	374.00	61.67	1.80E-09	312.33	354.33	255.85	290.25	273.05	34.40	2.51E-09	Cgl/MD. A number of narrow (<0.05 m thick) fault/rubble zones with some gouge infill from 321.8 to 326.6 m ID.
VL-GT-20-02	PT11	CSPT	333.33	374.00	40.67	-	333.33	354.33	273.05	290.25	281.65	17.20	-	Cgl/MD
VL-GT-20-02	PT10	SPT	354.33	374.00	19.67	2.84E-10	354.33	374.00	290.25	306.36	298.31	16.11	2.84E-10	Cgl
VL-GT-20-04	PT1	DPT	38.33	53.00	14.67	1.69E-06	38.33	53	36.02	49.80	42.91	13.79	1.69E-06	Tnj. Modelled_Fault 5 @ 49. 2 m ID (0.32 m zone with rubble and gouge). Also, 0.15 m rubble zone @ 39.6 m ID with iron-staining
VL-GT-20-04	PT2	DPT	105.33	125	19.67	1.21E-06	105.33	125	98.98	117.46	108.22	18.48	1.21E-06	Tnj. Modelled_Fault 4 from 106.5 m to 118 m ID (with a number of discrete narrow fault zones up to 0.12 m thick with rubble and gouge infill).
VL-GT-20-04	PT3	DPT	145.33	147.82	2.49	1.55E-07	145.33	147.82	136.57	138.91	137.74	2.34	1.55E-07	Tnj. Narrow (0.08 m thick) fault at 146.8 m ID with iron-stained gouge infill.
VL-GT-20-05	PT9	CSPT	4.33	182.00	177.67	2.50E-07	4.33	15.33	3.55	12.56	8.05	9.01	4.47E-07	Tnj
VL-GT-20-05	PT8	CSPT	15.33	182.00	166.67	2.37E-07	15.33	36.33	12.56	29.76	21.16	17.20	2.44E-07	Tnj/MD
VL-GT-20-05	PT7	CSPT	36.33	182.00	145.67	2.36E-07	36.33	57.33	29.76	46.96	38.36	17.20	1.29E-07	Tnj/MD
VL-GT-20-05	PT6	CSPT	57.33	182.00	124.67	2.54E-07	57.33	78.33	46.96	64.16	55.56	17.20	6.64E-08	Tnj
VL-GT-20-05	PT5	CSPT	78.33	182.00	103.67	2.92E-07	78.33	99.33	64.16	81.37	72.77	17.20	1.42E-06	Tnj. Several narrow fault/rubble zones (up to 0.11 m thick with some gouge infill) from 82.4 m to 94.8 m ID.
VL-GT-20-05	PT4	CSPT	99.33	182.00	82.67	4.36E-09	99.33	120.33	81.37	98.57	89.97	17.20	9.94E-09	Tnj/MD
VL-GT-20-05	PT3	CSPT	120.33	182.00	61.67	2.46E-09	120.33	141.33	98.57	115.77	107.17	17.20	3.60E-09	Tnj/MD
VL-GT-20-05	PT2	CSPT	141.33	182.00	40.67	1.87E-09	141.33	162.33	115.77	132.97	124.37	17.20	1.34E-09	Tnj. Modelled_Fault 2 @ 151.2 m ID (0.09 m zone with 0.2 m brittle sheared section above). Narrow (0.08 m) rubble zone @ 161 m ID.
VL-GT-20-05	PT1	SPT	162.33	182.00	19.67	2.44E-09	162.33	182.00	132.97	149.09	141.03	16.11	2.44E-09	Tnj
VL-GT-20-05	PT17	CSPT	182.00	350.00	168.00	3.66E-08	182.00	204.33	149.09	167.38	158.23	18.29	5.03E-08	Tnj. Modelled_Fault 7 (joint zone from 191 - 197 m ID).

#### Table 2 Summary of Packer Testing - Leprechaun Pit - cont.

	Packer	Packer Test Type	Test Interval (m ID)					Discrete Test Interval							
Borehole ID	Test ID		From	То	Test Length	Hydraulic Conductivity (m/sec)	From (m ID)	To (m ID)	From (m VD)	To (m VD)	Average Depth (m VD)	Test Length (m)	Hydraulic Conductivity (m/sec)	Lithology/Structure	
VL-GT-20-05	PT16	CSPT	204.33	350.00	145.67	3.45E-08	204.33	246.33	167.38	201.78	184.58	34.40	1.16E-07	Tnj/MD	
VL-GT-20-05	PT15	CSPT	225.33	350.00	124.67	-	225.33	246.33	184.58	201.78	193.18	17.20	-	Tnj	
VL-GT-20-05	PT14	CSPT	246.33	350.00	103.67	1.41E-09	246.33	267.33	201.78	218.98	210.38	17.20	1.69E-09	Tnj. Modelled_Fault 6 @ 256.8 m ID (0.01 m zone with gouge infill).	
VL-GT-20-05	PT13	CSPT	267.33	350.00	82.67	1.34E-09	267.33	288.33	218.98	236.19	227.59	17.20	4.79E-11	Tnj	
VL-GT-20-05	PT12	CSPT	288.33	350.00	61.67	1.78E-09	288.33	309.33	236.19	253.39	244.79	17.20	3.28E-10	Tnj	
VL-GT-20-05	PT11	CSPT	309.33	350.00	40.67	2.53E-09	309.33	330.33	253.39	270.59	261.99	17.20	3.63E-09	Tnj/MD. Narrow (0.003 m thick) fault zone at 324.8 m ID with clay infill.	
VL-GT-20-05	PT10	SPT	330.33	350.00	19.67	1.36E-09	330.33	350.00	270.59	286.70	278.65	16.11	1.36E-09	Tnj/MD	

#### Notes:

- DPT SPT
- ID VD

- Tnj MD

- Cgl Phyl VLFT
- ND "\_"
- Conglomerate Phyllite Valentine Lake Fault Not determined; test results not reliable Test results not reliable
- Cumulative Single Packer Test Double Packer Test Single Packer Test Inclined Depth Vertical Depth Trondhjemite Mafic Dyke

3





~0.11 L/min system losses at 35 psi (during packer inflation); considered negligible in comparison to test flows. At pump maximum output only 20 psi attainable pressure (due to large test interval). Test pressures based on transducer data.

Hydraulic conductivity value for test interval derived based on flow classification: Laminar (average for all steps).



~0.07 L/min system losses at 35 psi (during packer inflation); considered negligible in comparison to test flows. At pump maximum output only 20 psi attainable pressure (due to large test interval). Test pressures based on transducer data.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for steps 1 and 2 used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 3.78E-07 m/s.



~0.005 L/min system losses at 50 psi (during packer inflation); considered negligible in comparison to test flows. At pump maximum output only 20 psi attainable pressure (due to large test interval). Test pressures based on transducer data.

Hydraulic conductivity value for test interval derived based on flow classification: Laminar (average for all steps).



No leaks were noticed during packer inflation or testing. At pump maximum output only 20 psi attainable pressure (due to large test interval). Test pressures based on transducer data. Flow reading difficult due to high flows.

Hydraulic conductivity value for test interval derived based on flow classification: Laminar (average for all steps).



Hydraulic conductivity value for test interval derived based on flow classification: Laminar (average all steps).



Hydraulic conductivity value for test interval derived based on flow classification: Laminar (average all steps).



~0.05 L/min system losses at 50 psi (during packer inflation); considered negligible in comparison to test flows. Pressure adjustments required during steps 1, 3, 4, and 5.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 1.25E-7 m/s.



~0.28 L/min system losses at 100 psi (during packer inflation); considered negligible in comparison to test flows. Several pressure adjustments required during step 3.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for steps 1,2, and 3 used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 2.64E-8 m/s.



No leaks were noticed during packer inflation or testing. A pressure adjustment required during steps 1, 3, and 5.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 2.76E-8 m/s.



No leaks were noticed during packer inflation or testing. A pressure adjustment required during steps 1, 2, 3 and 5.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 3.18E-8 m/s.



~0.06 L/min system losses at 135 psi (during packer inflation); considered negligible in comparison to test flows. Several pressure adjustments required during step 3.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 3.59E-8 m/s.



No leaks were noticed during packer inflation or testing.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 3.01E-8 m/s.



Hydraulic conductivity value for test interval derived based on flow classification: Turbulent (Step 2).





Hydraulic conductivity value for test interval derived based on flow classification: Dilation (Step 1).






~0.01 L/min system losses at 98 psi (during packer inflation); considered negligible in comparison to test flows. Flowing artesian conditions; static water level not determined. Estimated -1 m below ground surface for purposes of analysis. Test pressures based on transducer data.





~0.07 L/min system losses at 100 psi (during packer inflation); considered negligible in comparison to test flows. Flowing artesian conditions; static water level not determined. Estimated -1 m below ground surface for purposes of analysis. Test pressures based on transducer data.



~0.08 L/min system losses at 118 psi (during packer inflation); considered negligible in comparison to test flows. Surface gauge pressure readings checked with transducer data. Flowing artesian conditions; static water level not determined. Estimated -1 m below ground surface for purposes of analysis.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for steps 1, 2, and 3 used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 3.32E-08 m/s.



~0.11 L/min system losses at 135 psi (during packer inflation). Not accounted for in test flow data. Flowing artesian conditions; static water level not determined. Estimated -1 m below ground surface for purposes of analysis.

No flow measured in step 1; the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for steps 2,3,4, and 5 used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 2.65E-09 m/s.



No leaks were noticed during packer inflation or testing. Flowing artesian conditions; static water level not determined. Estimated -1 m below ground surface for purposes of analysis. Sudden pressure release when decreasing from P4 to P5. Significantly greater flow rates for step 5, suggesting backflow washed material from fracture zones, increasing permeability.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Wash-out classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for steps 1, 2, and 3 used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 1.78E-08 m/s.



~0.19 L/min system losses at 210 psi (during packer inflation); considered negligible in comparison to test flows. Flowing artesian conditions; static water level not determined. Estimated -1 m below ground surface for purposes of analysis. Pressure adjustments required during testing. Pressure release and backflow when decreasing from P4 to P5. Significantly greater flow rates for step 5, suggesting backflow washed material from fracture zones, increasing permeability. Surface gauge pressure readings checked with transducer data.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Wash-out classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for steps 1, 2, 3, and 4 used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 1.82E-08 m/s.



~0.07 L/min system losses at 220 psi (during packer inflation); considered negligible in comparison to test flows. Flowing artesian conditions; static water level not determined. Estimated -1 m below ground surface for purposes of analysis. Pressure adjustments required during testing. Pressure release and backflow when decreasing from P4 to P5. Significantly greater flow rates for step 5, suggesting backflow washed material from fracture zones, increasing permeability. Surface gauge pressure readings checked with transducer data.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Wash-out classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for steps 1, 2, 3, and 4 used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 2.01E-08 m/s.



Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 1.13E-8 m/s.



No leaks were noticed during packer inflation or testing. Flowing artesian conditions; static water level not determined. Estimated -1 m below ground surface for purposes of analysis. Pressure adjustments required during step 3. Surface gauge pressure readings checked with transducer data.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 6.51E-09 m/s.



Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the hydraulic conductivity (K) value determined for step 1 used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 4.82E-09 m/s.



~0.08 L/min system losses at 240 psi (during packer inflation); considered negligible in comparison to test flows. Flowing artesian conditions; static water level not determined. Estimated -1 m below ground surface for purposes of analysis. Pressure adjustments required during step 3. Surface gauge pressure readings checked with transducer data.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for steps 1, 2, and 3 used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 7.08E-09 m/s.



~0.08 L/min system losses at 267 psi (during packer inflation); considered negligible in comparison to test flows. Flowing artesian conditions; static water level not determined. Estimated -1 m below ground surface for purposes of analysis. Slight pressure adjustments required during step 3. Surface gauge pressure readings checked with transducer data.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 8.47E-9 m/s.





Hydraulic conductivity value for test interval derived based on flow classification: Turbulent (Step 2).



Hydraulic conductivity value for test interval derived based on flow classification: Turbulent (Step 2).



Dolenole.

No leaks were noticed during packer inflation or testing. At pump maximum output only 40 psi attainable pressure. Pressure adjustments required during steps 1 and 3. Surface gauge pressure readings checked with transducer data.





No leaks were noticed during packer inflation or testing.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Dilation classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 1.44E-7 m/s.



~0.07 L/min system losses at 110 psi (during packer inflation). Not accounted for in test flow data. Test pressures higher than determined Pmax required to induce flow for steps 2, 3, and 4. Test pressure-flow profile does not suggest dilation, and test results at these steps are considered reliable.



~0.08 L/min system losses at 130 psi (during packer inflation). Not accounted for in test flow data. Test pressures higher than determined Pmax required to induce flow for all steps. Test pressure-flow profile does not suggest dilation and test results are considered reliable.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 7.63E-10 m/s.



No leaks were noticed during packer inflation or testing. Test pressures higher than determined Pmax required to induce flow for all steps. Test pressure-flow profile does not suggest dilation and test results are considered reliable. Several pressure adjustments required during steps 2 and 3.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 2.87E-10 m/s.



~0.08 L/min system losses at 130 psi (during packer inflation). Surface gauge pressure readings checked with transducer data.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 7.85E-10 m/s.







No leaks were noticed during packer inflation or testing. Test pressures higher than determined Pmax required to induce flow. Test pressure-flow profile does not suggest dilation and test results at these steps are considered reliable.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Turbulent classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 8.31E-7 m/s.



~0.18 L/min system losses at 58 psi (during packer inflation); considered negligible in comparison to test flows. Test pressures higher than determined Pmax required to induce flow. Test pressure-flow profile does not suggest dilation and test results at these steps are considered reliable.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Turbulent classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for steps 2, 3 and 4 used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 9.21E-07 m/s.



Hydraulic conductivity value for test interval derived based on flow classification: Turbulent (Step 2).



No leaks were noticed during packer inflation or testing.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Turbulent classification, the hydraulic conductivity (K) value determined for step 1 used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 1.13E-06 m/s.



Negative flow readings during leak test suggesting artesian pressures within test interval. Pressure adjustments required during step 2. Test pressures based on transducer data. Test pressures and flow data measured for step 1 not considered reliable.

The hydraulic conductivity (K) value determined for step 3 used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 1.62E-06 m/s.



Hydraulic conductivity value for test interval derived based on flow classification: Turbulent (Step 2).



No leaks were noticed during packer inflation or testing. Pressure adjustments required during steps 3, 4 and 5.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Turbulent classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 2.00E-7 m/s.





Hydraulic conductivity value for test interval derived based on flow classification: Turbulent (Step 2).


Leak test indicated 0.26L/min at 165 psi. Test flows within the same range as leak flows during steps 2, 3, and 4. Potential for enhanced hydraulic conductivity value determined for this test interval.





~0.12 L/min system losses at 30 psi (during packer inflation); considered negligible in comparison to test flows. Test pressures higher than determined Pmax required to induce flow. Test pressure-flow profile does not suggest dilation and test results at these steps are considered reliable. Test pressures based on transducer data.





~0.03 L/min system losses at 60 psi (during packer inflation); considered negligible in comparison to test flows. Test pressures higher than determined Pmax required to induce flow. Test pressure-flow profile does not suggest dilation and test results at these steps are considered reliable.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Laminar classification, the hydraulic conductivity (K) value determined for step 5 used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 2.02E-07 m/s.



~0.25 Lithin system losses at 60 psi (duning packer initiation), considered negligible in comparison to test i

Hydraulic conductivity value for test interval derived based on flow classification: Turbulent (Step 2).



~0.38 L/min system losses at 100 psi (during packer inflation); considered negligible in comparison to test flows. Minor reverse flow after test that stopped within 20 seconds.

Hydraulic conductivity value for test interval derived based on flow classification: Turbulent (Step 2).



~0.11 L/min system losses at 100 psi (during packer inflation); considered negligible in comparison to test flows. Minor reverse flow after test that stopped within 20 seconds.





~0.06 L/min system losses at 120 psi (during packer inflation); considered negligible in comparison to test flows. Reverse flow when going from steps 3 to 4 to 5; then downhole flow once stable pressure. Surface gauge pressure readings checked with transducer data.



~0.03 L/min system losses at 140 psi (during packer inflation); considered negligible in comparison to test flows. Reverse flow for a short period after opening valve after step 5. Surface gauge pressure readings checked with transducer data.



~0.33 L/min system losses at 220 psi (during packer inflation); not accounted for in test flow data.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 1.45E-09 m/s.



~0.32 L/min system losses at 200 psi (during packer inflation); not accounted for in test flow data. Surface gauge pressure readings checked with transducer data.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for step 1 used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 1.37E-9 m/s.



~0.34 L/min system losses at 200 psi (during packer inflation); not accounted for in test flow data.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 1.37E-9 m/s.



No leaks were noticed during packer inflation or testing.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for step 1 used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 1.49E-9 m/s.



~0.19 L/min system losses at 240 psi (during packer inflation); not accounted for in test flow data.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 1.65E-9 m/s.



~0.30 L/min system losses at 260 psi (during packer inflation); not accounted for in test flow data.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 1.80E-9 m/s.



~0.43 L/min system losses at 300 psi (during packer inflation); not accounted for in test flow data. Surface gauge pressure readings checked with transducer data.

Irregular, non-linear pressure-flow profile. The hydraulic conductivity (K) value determined for step 3 used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 2.84E-10 m/s.









Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for steps 1, 2, and 3 used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 2.50E-07 m/s.



No leaks were noticed during packer inflation or testing. Test pressures higher than determined Pmax required to induce flow. Test pressure-flow profile suggests some potential dilation that may result in enhanced hydraulic conductivity value determined for this test interval.

Hydraulic conductivity value for test interval derived based on flow classification: Dilation (step 1).



No leaks were noticed during packer inflation or testing. Difficulty maintaining constant pressure during steps. Following testing, and bladder removal hole flowing. Possible artesian pressures in the test interval.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 2.49E-7 m/s.



No leaks were noticed during packer inflation or testing. Surface gauge pressure readings checked with transducer data. Difficulty maintaining constant pressure during steps. Following step 5, ~20 L/min backflow with pump off; dissipated once bladder was deflated. Possible artesian pressures in the test interval.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 2.54E-7 m/s.



~0.04 L/min system losses at 80 psi (during packer inflation); considered negligible in comparison to test flows. Difficulty maintaining constant pressure during steps. Possible artesian pressures in the test interval. Surface gauge pressure readings checked with transducer data.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 2.92E-7 m/s.



~0.05 L/min system losses at 90 psi (during packer inflation); not accounted for in test flow data. Slightly slowing flows during steps 1, 2, and 3, and increasing flows observed in steps 4 and 5. Pressure adjustments required during testing. Surface gauge pressure readings checked with transducer data. Possible artesian pressures in the test interval.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 4.36E-09 m/s.



~0.08 L/min system losses at 90 psi (during packer inflation); not accounted for in test flow data. Slowing flows observed in steps 1, 2, 3, and backflow at start of step 5; suggest potential artesian pressures in the test interval.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 2.46E-9 m/s.



No leaks were noticed during packer inflation or testing. Backflow when decreasing pressure from step 3 to step 4 to step 5. Backflow in step 5; hydraulic conductively not determined for this step.

The arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for steps 1, 3, 3 and 4 used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 1.87E-09 m/s.



Performed using a single packer test assembly as the borehole was advanced, with the bottom of the test interval bounded by the bottom of the drilled section of the borehole.

No leaks were noticed during packer inflation or testing. Surface gauge pressure readings checked with transducer data. Backflow when decreasing pressure from step 3 to step 4 to step 5. Backflow in step 5; hydraulic conductively not determined for this step.

The arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for steps 1, 3, 3 and 4 used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 2.44E-09 m/s.



~0.25 L/min system losses at 150 psi (during packer inflation); considered negligible in comparison to test flows. Pressure adjustments required during steps 2, 3, and 5. Backflow when decreasing from P3 to P4 to P5, suggesting artesian conditions in the test interval.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for step 1 used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 3.66E-08 m/s.



~0.25 L/min system losses at 180 psi (during packer inflation); considered negligible in comparison to test flows. Pressure adjustments required during steps 1, 2, 3, and 5. At the end of the test with value opened measured ~5 - 10 PSI with backflow, suggesting artesian conditions in the test interval.

Although pressure-flow step profile suggests a Void Filling classification, the arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 3.45E-8 m/s.





~0.05 L/min system losses at 220 psi (during packer inflation); not accounted for in test flow data. Pressure adjustments required during steps 2 and 3. Surface gauge pressure readings checked with transducer data.






~0.17 L/min system losses at 260 psi (during packer inflation); not accounted for in test flow data. Test flows within the same range as leak flows during steps steps. Potential for enhanced hydraulic conductivity value determined for this test interval.

Irregular, non-linear pressure-flow profile. The arithmetic mean (average) of the hydraulic conductivity (K) values determined for all steps used to calculate the representative K value for the test interval - K = 1.36E-9 m/s.