P-11-34

Investigation for identification of potential geological signatures for geophysical objects

Christin Döse, Seje Carlsten Geosigma AB

September 2017

Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB

Swedish Nuclear Fuel and Waste Management Co

Box 250, SE-101 24 Stockholm Phone +46 8 459 84 00

Tänd ett lager: SKB P-11-34 P, R eller TR. ID 1219971 ISSN 1651-4416 September 2017

Investigation for identification of potential geological signatures for geophysical objects

Christin Döse, Seje Carlsten Geosigma AB

This report concerns a study which was conducted for Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB (SKB). The conclusions and viewpoints presented in the report are those of the authors. SKB may draw modified conclusions, based on additional literature sources and/or expert opinions.

Data in SKB's database can be changed for different reasons. Minor changes in SKB's database will not necessarily result in a revised report. Data revisions may also be presented as supplements, available at www.skb.se.

A pdf version of this document can be downloaded from www.skb.se.

© 2017 Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB

Contents

1 Introduction

SKB conducts detailed investigations in Forsmark where the future deep repository for spent nuclear fuel is planned. A major issue when establishing the deep repository is to identify and avoid "long" fractures or fracture zones that can potentially be reactivated and thereby shear deposition holes.

These "long" fractures or fracture zones are believed to be identified by combining geological mapping of tunnel and borehole walls with geophysical measurements, for example radar measurements. Both geological mapping and geophysical measurements of boreholes were extensively carried out during the site investigation programmes in Forsmark and Oskarshamn. However, primary borehole data were not systematically processed with the aim to identify the geological character of the geophysical objects, for example radar reflectors.

Some special investigations have though been performed earlier where radar-reflectors have been correlated with geology. On the other hand, the previous investigations have not described the fractures and rock contacts causing radar reflector in detail. The earlier performed investigations are as follows:

- Borehole radar correlated with core mapping, Site Investigation Forsmark (Appendix in Stephens and Skagius 2007).
- Borehole radar correlated with core mapping, Site Investigation Oskarshamn (Carlsten 2004).
- Borehole radar correlated with tunnel mapping, \ddot{A} spö HRL (Calsten et al. 1995, SKB 1994).
- GPR correlated with tunnel mapping, Äspö HRL (Stenberg and Forslund 1995, Olsson 1992).

The results from the earlier study of data from Forsmark can be concluded as follows. Of the oriented radar reflectors 45 % can be correlated with contacts between different rock types, 37 % with an open fracture, a crush or a breccia and only 10 % with sealed fracture or sealed fracture networks. It was hence concluded that the directional antenna is able to detect rock contacts more efficiently than open fractures, crush zones or breccias, while the method is not effective for the detection of sealed fractures, sealed networks, alteration and foliation.

The earlier GPR studies at Äspö HRL reveal that there is a generally good agreement between high magnitude radar reflectors and significant features observed in the tunnel, such as water bearing fractures, fracture zones, water inflow to the tunnel or boreholes or need of reinforcement. Some reflectors are correlated with dikes of fine-grained granite. Reflectors of low magnitude were uncertain and could be artifacts.

In this work extensive oriented radar reflectors were correlated with the corresponding geology. An attempt was made to identify the geological signatures of these reflectors with emphasis on fracture and fracture zone properties, i.e. mineralogy, width, aperture, alteration, roughness, surface, occurrence of kinematic indicators and water content. Data from the site investigations in Forsmark and Oskarshamn, as well as the SFR expansion-project and the Äspö HRL have been studied. At Äspö HRL also GPR reflectors have been studied.

2 Objective and scope

The work presented in this report is a follow-up to earlier performed studies of radar reflectors correlated with geology. The aim with this study is to identify which geological structures correlate with extensive radar reflectors and to assess whether or not there are specific geological attributes in the structures that correlate with extensive radar reflectors. The result will be used as input for establishing an experiment and writing a programme for development of methodology and technique for identification of "long" fractures and fracture zones.

The work was carried out in three main steps:

- 1) Correlation between extensive radar reflectors and geological structures.
- 2) Creation of Sicada tables and input of data to Sicada.
- 3) Evaluation of geological signatures of the reflectors.

The correlations between extensive radar reflectors and geology were based on three different methods:

- 1a) Correlation between borehole radar and core mapping (Forsmark and Oskarshamn site investigations, SFR extension).
- 1b) Correlation between borehole radar and tunnel mapping (Äspö HRL).
- 1c) Correlation between ground penetrating radar (GPR) and tunnel mapping (Äspö HRL).

The correlations with geological structures in boreholes have been performed irrespective of whether the structures occur along possible deformation zones (SHI) or not, while the correlations with geological structures in tunnels usually could be made with the deformation zone itself or with structures outside the deformation zone.

The boreholes investigated in 1a) above were:

- Site Investigation Forsmark: KFM04A, KFM05A, KFM06A, KFM06C, KFM07A, KFM08A, KFM08C, KFM09A, KFM09B, KFM11A, KFM12A.
- Site Investigation SFR expansion: KFR101, KFR102A, KFR104 and KFR27.
- Site Investigation Oskarshamn: KLX14A, KLX15A, KLX20A and KLX27A.

The boreholes investigated in 1b) above were: KA0575A, KA1061A, KA1131B, KA1754A, KA2048B, KA2162B, KA3191F, C2, C3 and C6 (later renamed to KXZC2, KXZC3 and KXZC6). The radar reflectors from loggings in these boreholes could be correlated to geological structures in the TASAtunnel sections $619-752$ m, $1777-2377$ m and $3193-3364$ m and in TASZ-tunnel section \sim 18.9–71.8 m.

The GPR-measurements in 1c) were performed on tunnel walls in the following tunnel sections: TASZ (\sim 18.9–71.8 m) and TASA (\sim 3 174.3–3 245 m).

The data to be investigated were chosen on the following criteria:

- The geological properties of the reflectors were believed to be site specific. Forsmark area was prioritized since SKB had decided to apply for a repository in this area. The boreholes chosen cover the planned deposition area and have well oriented mapping data (Döse et al. 2008).
- All boreholes where directional radar logging had been performed by summer 2009 within the project SFR expansion were selected.
- The number of boreholes from site Oskarshamn was decided to be four. These four boreholes were selected due to their well oriented mapping data and their diverging borehole directions.
- The boreholes at Äspö HRL were chosen because radar reflectors from loggings in these boreholes had already been correlated with tunnel mapping (Calsten et al. 1995, SKB 1994).
- The GPR-profiles at Äspö HRL were chosen due to their favourable position for correlation with tunnel mapping.

3 Terminology

4 Execution

4.1 In-data

Necessary in-data have been requested from Sicada, such as

- oriented borehole radar data (GP140),
- geological mapping of drill cores (GE041),
- correlation of pfl-anomalies with drill core-mapping (HY688),
- kinematic indications (GE303),
- interpreted (GE300 and GE302) and modeled deformation zones (GE306) (Stephens et al. 2007, Wahlgren et al. 2008).

The following Sicada deliveries have been used as in-data:

- 1216751 Data Delivery SICADA 09 108
- 1217523 Data Delivery SICADA 09 116
- 1218354 Data Delivery SICADA_09_121
- 1219024 Data Delivery SICADA 09 128
- 1220232 Data Delivery SICADA_09_138
- 1220905 Data Delivery SICADA_09_148

Since no images are stored in Sicada, the radar data in Sicada are complemented with the study of radar maps from P-reports produced during the Forsmark site investigation (Gustafsson and Gustafsson 2004a, b,c, 2005a, b, c, 2006a, b, c, 2007a, b), during the SFR site investigation (Gustafsson and Gustafsson 2008a, 2009) and during the Oskarshamn site investigation (Gustafsson and Gustafsson 2006d, e, 2007c, 2008b). From the radar maps, which are found in the Appendices of the mentioned P-reports, the detectable distance of the reflector from the borehole is registered.

The geological mapping of the Äspö HRL tunnel is not incorporated into the Sicada database, but exists separately in its own database: the TMS-database. Excel-files with tunnel mapping data from the investigated tunnel intervals were retrieved from Äspö HRL. Also pdf-files with tunnel mapping were retrieved as well as a dgn-file with tunnel mapping data from the GPR-intervals. Borehole radar data were mainly taken from reports Calsten et al. (1995) and SKB (1993, 1994).

The GPR-reflectors were retrieved from and a dgn-file (Figure 3-1 in the report).

4.2 Correlation of radar reflectors with geology

4.2.1 Correlation of oriented borehole radar with core mapping

The correlation of oriented borehole radar with core mapping was performed as follows. The radius of oriented radar reflectors were determined by inspection of radar maps (Gustafsson and Gustafsson 2004a, b,c, 2005a, b, c, 2006a, b, c, d, e, 2007a, b, c, 2008a, b, 2009). Reflectors with a radius exceeding $~18$ m were considered to be extensive and analyzed further. In the investigated boreholes from Forsmark there were 122 extensive oriented radar reflectors having a radius ranging from 18 to 130 m (median radius was 20 m). In the investigated boreholes from SFR and Oskarshamn there were 18 and 27 extensive oriented radar reflectors, respectively. The span in radius was 18–54 m in SFR-boreholes (median 20 m) and 18–110 m in Oskarshamn-boreholes (median 30 m).

During the second stage, the extensive radar reflectors were correlated with core mapping. Geological structures with alpha angle $(\pm 10^{\circ})$ and strike $(\pm 20^{\circ})$ /dip $(\pm 20^{\circ})$ similar to that of the radar reflector and within a span of ± 2 m borehole length (± 3 m if the alfa angle is $\leq 30^{\circ}$) from the radar reflector were considered confident candidates of the reflector. If the alpha angle was small $(< 45^{\circ}$) the error in alpha was likely to be less than $\pm 7^{\circ}$, while if the alpha angle was great ($\geq 70^{\circ}$) the error

in alpha was likely to be as much as $\pm 10^{\circ}$. These accuracy spans are personal judgments and have been fine-tuned relative to previous works, Stephens and Skagius (2007) and Carlsten (2004). Another discrepancy from previous works is that the correlations are not performed by visual inspection of the BIPS-image in the software Boremap, but by looking at figures (mainly borehole lengths, alpha angles and strike/dip-values) in the database.

In the case were several possible geological candidates could be correlated with a reflector, a judgment was made regarding which of the candidates was the most reliable. For example, fractures not visible in BIPS or fractures only indicated by oxidized walls were excluded as confident candidates. Sometimes several candidates together were believed to cause the reflector, for example three parallel fractures.

When the correlation was carried out, a confidence was set for the correlation. Only correlations of high or medium confidence were investigated further, while correlations of low confidence were considered too unreliable for making any conclusions of the geological properties of the reflector.

Finally, the correlation data were imported to Sicada as a new activity (GP139).

4.2.2 Correlation of oriented borehole radar with tunnel mapping

The correlation of oriented borehole radar reflectors from tunnel boreholes with tunnel mapping was made as follows. In reports of borehole radar investigations in the different boreholes (Calsten et al. 1995, SKB 1994) a calculation of intersection with nearby tunnel sections is presented in form of tables and figures. The intersection is mainly presented as a value of the tunnel length where the oriented radar reflector is calculated to intersect. Since the calculations are based on the radar orientation values, there is an error which leaves some uncertainty about the exact intersection with tunnel. Also, the geometry between borehole and tunnel is important for the uncertainty of intersection. Therefore, a visual inspection of the tunnel maps was made at the calculated intersections and the closest surroundings, in order to find structures in the tunnel mapping having corresponding orientations as the borehole radar reflectors.

The tunnel section at KA3191F had to be reinterpreted when it was discovered that the orientation of candidates presented in Carlsten et al. (1995) no longer agreed with present tunnel data.

When finding the geological structure (fracture, zone or lithological contact) which was considered causing the radar reflector, the unique MSlink of the mapped structure was retrieved from the TMSdatabase. A confidence was also set for the correlation (high, medium or low) based on the agreement between the orientation of the reflector and the orientation of the geological structure as well as the position of the geological structure in the tunnel relative to the calculated intersection length of the reflector with the tunnel.

The radius of the oriented borehole radar reflectors that were correlated with tunnel mapping have not been evaluated as was the case for borehole radar reflectors that were correlated with core mapping. Hence, also reflectors that are not interpreted as extensive are included in this evaluation.

The correlations were documented in an Excel-file and imported to Sicada as a GP138 activity.

4.2.3 Correlation of ground penetrating radar with tunnel mapping

The correlation of ground penetrating radar with tunnel mapping was performed by visual inspection of two overlapping dgn-files: one displaying GPR-reflectors and one displaying the tunnel mapping (Figure 4-1). To make the correlation easy, only the horizontal GPR-profiles were investigated, since the strike of the reflector is almost equal to the strike of the geological structure. Hence the correlation could be performed in 2D.

In the dgn-file the strike of the reflector was compared with strikes of structures in the tunnel mapping in order to find similar strikes. The strikes of structures in the tunnel mapping are only displayed correctly in the tunnel mid-line. In order to make the visual comparison easier, GPRreflectors were extended to tunnel mid-line. When finding one or more geological structures with similar strike, the position along the tunnel was also compared. The ones with best fit have the same position as the reflector in the tunnel wall.

Figure 4-1. Example of 2D-image used for visual correlation of GPR-reflectors (blue and green dashed lines) with tunnel mapping data. TASA, Section 3193–3 245.

When finding the geological structure (fracture, zone or lithological contact) which causes the reflector, the unique MSlink of the mapped structure was retrieved from the TMS-database. A confidence was also set for the correlation based on the agreement between strikes and position in tunnel.

The tunnel lengths, angles to tunnel wall and strikes of the GPR-reflectors were measured in the dgn-file and documented in an Excel-file, together with the correlations with tunnel mapping (MS-link) and were exported to Sicada as a GP350 activity. The GPR-reflectors had not been imported to Sicada previously.

4.3 Analysis of data

The core mapping or tunnel mapping data were compiled for the geological structures that were correlated with oriented borehole radar/GPR reflectors with medium or high confidence. The unique FeatureID of the core mapping data was used to find possible correlation with pfl-anomalies (HY688). Water content and type could be found in the tunnel mapping database (TMS). It was also noted if the correlated geological structure belongs to a possible deformation zone that has not been modeled deterministically or a deformation zone that has been modeled deterministically (Stephens et al. 2007, Wahlgren et al. 2008).

Mineralogy, alteration, width, aperture, roughness, surface, J_a -number and water content of the fractures or fracture zones, as well as rock contacts, which were identified with radar were compiled and compared with background data. Properties of fractures are mapped slightly differently in boreholes relative to tunnel. In the TMS-database fracture fillings are not only minerals but also rock types, whereas in the borehole data only minerals are denoted as fracture filling (with the exception of oxidized walls). Some of the compilation was based on weighted data, while others were based on non-weighted data (see chapter 4.3.1 below).

FPI-fractures are considered especially interesting. The properties of FPI-fractures correlated with a reflector relative to those with no correlation with a reflector have been compared.

4.3.1 Weighted and non-weighted data

Since many reflectors could be correlated with more than one possible candidate, and it was impossible to decide which one of the candidates caused the reflector or if they caused it together, data was weighted before the summary of correlations. The weighting was performed as follows:

- • The sum of the weighted values for all candidates to one reflector was equal to 1.
- A candidate with confidence 3 was weighted twice as much as a candidate with confidence 2.
- A candidate with confidence 1 was weighted as 0, i.e. it was not considered as a confident candidate for the reflector and was therefore not included in the analysis of the properties of the reflectors.

An example of the above mentioned weighting follows. If a reflector had three candidates, one of high confidence and two of medium confidence, the one with high confidence was weighted as 0.5 while the two with medium confidence was weighted as 0.25 each, i.e. the weighted sum is 1.

Fracture mineralogy, alteration and roughness data were not weighted, as weighted data would have complicated the analysis unreasonably much. Up to four mapped minerals were encountered in the analysis for the core mapping data, and up to five mapped minerals/fracture fillings (in some cases rock types are mapped as fracture fillings) were encountered in the analysis of tunnel mapping data.

4.3.2 Background data

The properties of the geological structures (fractures, crushes and rock contacts) correlated with oriented radar reflectors were compared with corresponding background properties. For example, mineralogy of open fractures giving rise to a radar reflector was compared with mineralogy of all open fractures in the investigated boreholes/tunnel sections at the site in question. No differentiation has been made whether the fracture, crush or rock contact is situated within a deformation zone or not. The used background data are listed in Table 4-1.

4.3.3 Analysis of deformation zones and crushes with no radar reflector

Possible deformation zones determined in the SHI or ESHI which have no radar reflector were identified. The radargrams from the intervals with possible deformation zones were studied. No further analysis was considered necessary.

Crush with no radar reflector were also identified and studied in more detail. Crush with no radar reflector were compared with background.

5 Data handling

This activity resulted in new Sicada-tables and parameters. The new tables and parameters are listed in Table 5-1.

Activity	Table	Parameter	Reference in this report
GP139	radar dir feature id	bhradar boremap feat	Section 4.2.1 and 6.1
GP138	radar dir mslink	bhradar_tms_fract bhradar tms contact bhradar tms fraczon1 bhradar tms rock	Section 4.2.2 and 6.2
GP351	tunnel gpr refl tms	tungpr_tms_fract tungpr tms contact tungpr tms fractzon1 tungpr tms rock	Section 4.2.3 and 6.3

Table 5-1. New Sicada tables and parameters created within this activity.

6 Results

6.1 Borehole radar versus core mapping

6.1.1 Forsmark Site Investigation

122 extensive oriented radar reflectors were investigated. Of these 96 (79 %) could be confidently correlated with a geological structure (Table 6-1). Most of the reflectors correspond to rock contacts (31 %), sealed fractures (27 %) or open fractures (15 %). Only 3 % of the reflectors can be correlated with crush and only 2 % to sealed networks. This means that more sealed fractures were correlated with oriented radar reflectors on behalf of open fractures, crush and rock contacts in comparison with an earlier performed investigation (see Stephens and Skagius 2007).

The extensive oriented radar reflectors have mostly intersection angles with the borehole of 30–60° (Figure 6-1). Extensive oriented radar reflectors correlated with geological structures seem to show some overrepresentation in the alpha-interval 40–50° (Figures A1-1 to A1-4).

Table 6-1. Summary of results from correlating oriented radar reflectors with borehole mapping in KFM-boreholes.

* Correlations of medium or high confidence.

** Open and partly open fracture(s).

*** SUM can be greater than NO of correlated reflectors due to several candidates.

**** SUM can be greater than 100 due to several candidates.

Figure 6-1. Alpha angles of oriented extensive borehole radar reflectors, Forsmark site investigation.

Most rock contacts, fractures, crushes or sealed networks which cause radar reflectors follow the orientation pattern in the background data from the Forsmark site (Appendix 2a).

The mineralogy of fractures causing a radar reflector is presented in Figure A3a-1 – A3a-4 as well as Table A3b-1. It can be tempting to draw the conclusion from the figures that calcite, chlorite, hematite and pyrite are overrepresented in fractures correlated with a reflector relative to background data, but the amount of data is rather small and the overrepresentation is only minor. Therefore overrepresentations should only be considered a hint.

Open fractures giving rise to a radar reflector are generally only slightly altered, while sealed fractures are generally fresh (Table A4-1), which are the general appearances of open and sealed fractures in Forsmark. The most altered fractures (highly altered, completely altered or gouges) do not result in extensive radar reflectors.

Fractures correlated with oriented radar reflectors are generally only 0.5 mm wide, planar or stepped with a rough surface (Table A5-1 & Table A5-6).

Table 6-2. The proportion of kinematic indicators and pfl-anomalies in fractures correlated with extensive oriented radar reflectors. Non-weighted data. Forsmark site investigation.

* Fractures within possible deformation zones that have no documented kinematic indicator.

** Kinematics in fractures outside possible deformation zones are generally not investigated. DZ5 in KFM04A and DZ5 in KFM06C are also lacking kinematical data.

*** No correlations between pfl-anomalies and fractures were retrieved from boreholes KFM06C, KFM09A, KFM09B and KFM12A.

Only two of the fractures that correlated with extensive oriented radar reflectors in Forsmark have a documented kinematic indicator, despite that as many as 431 fractures have documented kinematic indicators in the investigated boreholes (Table 6-2). Nine fractures correlated with extensive oriented radar reflectors have an interpreted pfl-anomaly. In total there are as many as 1917 fractures with interpreted pfl-anomalies in the 11 boreholes studied at Forsmark.

Of the rock contacts giving rise to a radar reflector about 40 % are contacts between metagranitegranodiorite (101057) and pegmatite (101061) while about 20 % are contacts between metagranitegranodiorite (101057) and amphibolites (102017, Table 6-3). Pegmatite or amphibolite occur in \sim 75 % of the rock contacts that are confidently correlated with oriented radar reflectors. Other contacts giving rise to radar reflectors are subordinate.

Table 6-3. Character of rock contacts that were confidently correlated with extensive oriented radar reflectors in KFM-boreholes. Non-weighted values.

6.1.2 SFR Site Investigation

18 extensive oriented radar reflectors were investigated. Of these 15 reflectors (83 %) could be confidently correlated with a geological structure (Table 6-4). Two of the reflectors that could not be correlated with any geological structure were out of the geological mapping range. Most of the reflectors correspond to open fractures (43 %), rock contacts (20 %) and sealed fractures (18 %). Only one of the reflectors can be correlated with crush.

Table 6-4. Summary of results from correlating oriented radar reflectors with borehole mapping in KFR-boreholes. SFR Site Investigation.

	No	Weighted correlations* % of all	No	% of all	High confidence correlations**	Reflectors Total
Total no of reflectors						18
Coupled reflectors	15	83	12	67		
Non-coupled reflectors	3	17	6	33		
Reflectors coupled to:						
- open fracture(s)***	7.7	43	5	28		
- crush	0.5	3	1	6		
- sealed fracture(s)	3.3	18	3	17		
- sealed network	0	0	0	0		
- rock contact	3.6	20	3	17		
- other	Ω	Ω	$\mathbf 0$	0		
Sum	15		12			

* Coupling with medium to high confidence.

** No of reflectors with high confidence, not weighted.

*** Open and partly open fracture(s).

The intersection angles of the extensive oriented radar reflectors with the borehole vary (Figure 6-2). Diagrams showing alpha angles of reflectors correlated with open fractures, sealed fractures, crush and rock contacts are shown in Figures A1-5 to A1-8, but the data set is too small to make statistically valid conclusions. The same counts for the orientations of rock occurrences and open fractures correlated with oriented radar reflector relative to main contact and fracture orientations in SFR, which are shown in Appendix 2b, the mineralogy of fractures causing a radar reflector which is presented in Figure A3a-5 and A3a-6, as well as Table A3b-2 and finally also width, aperture, alteration and roughness of fractures correlated with extensive oriented radar reflectors (Table A4-2, Table A5-2 and Table A5-6).

Six rock contacts of different character have been identified as confident radar reflectors (Table 6-5). Four of the contacts are also correlated with parallel crush or fractures.

6.1.3 Site Investigation Oskarshamn

27 extensive oriented radar reflectors were investigated. The amount of the studied reflectors is too small to make any statistically valid conclusions. The figures that follow in this chapter are only for presentation of the results in this investigation, but they do not necessarily describe the real character of the extensive radar reflectors.

Of the 27 investigated extensive oriented radar reflectors, 22 (81 %) could be confidently correlated with a geological structure (Table 6-6). Most of the reflectors correspond to open fractures (35 %), rock contacts (22 %), or sealed fractures (16 %). Only 6 % of the reflectors can be correlated with crush and only 2 % to sealed fracture networks.

Most extensive oriented radar reflectors have intersection angles with the borehole of 20–50° (Figure 6-3). Diagrams showing alpha angles of reflectors correlated with open fractures, sealed fractures, crush and rock contacts are shown in Figures A1-9 to A1-12.

Table 6-5. Character of rock contacts that were confidently correlated with extensive oriented radar reflectors in KFR-boreholes. Non-weighted values. SFR site investigation.

Rock 1	Rock 2	no	%
Metagranite-granodiorite	Breccia		17
Pegmatite	Breccia	1	17
Pegmatite	Fine-grained granite	1	17
Pegmatite	Metagranite-granodiorite	2	33
Pegmatite		17	
Total amount of rock contacts correlated with extensive oriented radar reflectors	6	100	

Figure 6-2. Alpha angles of extensive oriented borehole radar reflectors, SFR site investigation.

Figure 6-3. Alpha angles of extensive oriented borehole radar reflectors, Oskarshamn site investigation.

	Weighted correlations*			Non-weighted correlations*		
	No	$%$ of all	No	$%$ of all	Total (no)	
Total No of reflectors					27	
Correlated reflectors	22	81	22	81		
Non-correlated reflectors	5	19	5	19		
Structures correlated with reflectors:						
-open fracture(s)**	9.5	35	28	104		
-crush	1.7	6	5	19		
-sealed fracture(s)	4.4	16	16	59		
-sealed network	0.6	$\overline{2}$	$\overline{2}$	7		
-rock contact	5.9	22	16	59		
-other	0	0	0	0		
Sum	22.0	81	$67***$	248****		

Table 6-6. Summary of results from correlating oriented radar reflectors with borehole mapping in KLX-boreholes. Oskarshamn site investigation.

* Correlations of medium or high confidence.

** Open and partly open fracture(s).

 $*$ SUM can be breater than NO of correlated reflectors due to several candidates.

**** SUM can be greater than 100 due to several candidates.

The orientation of open fractures, crush and rock contacts that correlate with extensive radar reflectors are in accordance with the most dominating orientations of the structure in question (Appendix 2c).

The mineralogy of fractures, fracture networks and crushes causing an extensive radar reflector are presented in Figures A3a-7 – A3a-10 and Table A3b-3. There is no clear difference between the mineralogy of fractures correlated with extensive radar reflectors compared to all fractures in the investigated boreholes.

The width, aperture, alteration, roughness and surface of fractures resulting in extensive radar reflectors are presented in Table A4-3, Table A5-3 and Table A5-6. There are no great differences in these properties between fractures with extensive reflectors and fractures as a whole in the investigated boreholes.

None of the fractures correlated with oriented radar reflectors has any kinematic indicator in Oskarshamn (Table 6-7). In the investigated boreholes from Oskarshamn 48 fractures with kinematic indicators have been documented (only results from KLX15A and KLX20A). 12 fractures correlated with extensive oriented radar reflectors in Oskarshamn have an interpreted pfl-anomaly. In total there are 723 fractures with interpreted pfl-anomalies in the four boreholes studied at Oskarshamn.

Table 6-7. Numbers of fractures with kinematic indicator and/or pfl-anomalies in fractures correlated with extensive oriented radar reflectors. Non-weighted data. Oskarshamn site investigation.

		Kinematic indicator			Pfl-anomaly	
Fracture type	TOT	Fracture with kinematic indicator	Fracture with no kinematic indicator*	No information**	Fracture with pfl-anomaly	Fracture with no pfl-anomaly
Open and partly open fractures correlated with extensive radar reflector	28	$\mathbf 0$	2	26	9	19
Sealed fractures correlated with extensive radar reflector	16	$\mathbf 0$		9	3	13

* Fractures within possible deformation zones that have no documented kinematic indicator.

** Kinematic indicators were not investigated in KLX14A and KLX27A. In KLX15A and KLX20A kinematics in fractures outside possible deformation zones were generally not investigated.

Only two highly confident correlations between an extensive radar reflector and a rock contact have been made. Both are contacts between quartz monzodiorite (501036) and fine-grained granite (511058). If correlations of medium confidence are included, 16 rock contacts are identified by radar. The amount is too small to make statistically valid conclusions about their character. Of the correlated rock contacts over 60 % are contacts between Quartz monzodiorite and Fine-grained granite (Table 6-8) while roughly 40 % can be explained by change in structure and not necessarily by contact between two different rock types.

Table 6-8. Character of rock contacts that were confidently correlated with extensive oriented radar reflectors in KLX-boreholes. Non-weighted values. Site Investigation Oskarshamn.

Rock 1	Rock 2	No	%		
Quartz monzodiorite	Fine-grained granite	8	50	no	%
Quartz monzodiorite	Fine-grained granite, cataclastic	2	13	10	63
Quartz monzodiorite	Quartz monzodiorite, brittle-ductile shear zone	3	19		
Quartz monzodiorite	Mafic rock, brittle-ductile shear zone		6		44
Mafic rock, fine-grained	Mafic rock, breccia		6		
Quartz monzodiorite	Dolerite	1	6		
Total amount of rock contacts correlated with extensive radar reflectors			100		

6.1.4 Crush and possible deformation zones with no radar reflector

Crushes that have no radar reflector have been studied in order to characterize the crushes that are not captured by radar. Crushes with possible short oriented radar reflector or non-oriented radar reflectors are excluded in this study. There are 44 crushes in Forsmark, 40 crushes in SFR and 23 crushes in Oskarshamn that have no radar reflector. These constitute about half of all mapped crushes in Forsmark and Oskarshamn, and most of the crushes in the SFR-area (Table 6-9).

The alpha angles of the crushes with no radar reflector relative to all mapped crushes in the investigated boreholes (background data) are presented in Figure 6-4. Alpha angles of crushes with no reflector are generally slightly underrepresented within the interval 50–70° relative to alpha angles of all crushes, while alpha angles of 80–90° are slightly overrepresented. The orientations of crushes with no reflector generally reflect the overall crush orientations in the sites Forsmark, SFR and Oskarshman (Figures A2a-7, A2b-7 and A2c-7, respectively).

Alpha-angles of crush contacts with no radar reflector relative to background. Forsmark, SFR and Oskarshamn sites.

Figure 6-4. Alpha angles of oriented crush contacts with no radar reflector relative to background. Number of data is:■=97, ■=96, ■=184 and ■=183. Not all crushes listed in Table 6-9 are oriented which explains the smaller number of crushes relative to Table 6-9.

There is no clear difference in mineralogy between crushes not detected by borehole radar relative to all crushes in the investigated boreholes (Figure A6-1, A6-2 and A6-3, Table A6-1). The same is valid for alteration and width along borehole (Table A6-2 and A6-3).

Since the core mapping system does not reveal the character of the crush, i.e. if the fragments are rounded (a "real" crush), if there is outfall/aperture or if the crush is only a fractured section with no signs of greater displacement (but with crushed drill core), the crushes with no reflector have been divided into "crush" and "fractures mapped as crush" (Table A6-4). Quite a large number of the mapped crushes with no radar reflector are actually single fractures with aperture or a fractured section with no signs of rounded fragments. The parallelism of upper and lower contacts has also been looked at (Table A6-5), but with no valuable results.

Type of reflector/no reflector	Forsmark	SFR	Oskarshamn
	No.	No	No
Crush with possible extensive oriented radar reflector*	12	4	9
Crush with possible short oriented radar reflector	14	0	3
Crush with possible non-oriented radar reflector	31		10
Crush with no radar reflector	44	40	23
TOT crushes	101	45	45

Table 6-9. Number of crushes with possible radar reflectors and crushes with no radar.

*Note! Also correlations of low confidence are included in this table.

Our task was also to look at borehole radar reflectors in relation to possible deformation zones. In Appendix 7a possible deformation zones with no extensive oriented radar reflector are listed, while in Appendix 7b possible deformation zones with no radar reflector at all are listed. Possible deformation zones with no radar reflector are not found in the investigated boreholes from Forsmark, while only two very minor possible deformation zones can be found in the boreholes from Oskarshamn. One of them has a radar reflector within 2 m away from the possible deformation zone (DZ 5 in KLX14). Most of the possible deformation zones with no radar reflector are found in Site Investigation SFR. One possible deformation zone, DZ6 in KFR104, is out of range of the radar logging, while DZ4 in KFR101, DZ3 in KFR102A, DZ3 and DZ4 in KFR27 are characterized by poor radar penetration (Gustafsson and Gustafsson 2008a, 2009). The remaining possible deformation zones seem to have short reflectors in the radargram in the report, although no reflector is documented in GP140.

Possible deformation zones with no extensive oriented radar reflector are not studied in detail in this work. Probable reasons for lacking extensive oriented radar reflectors are poor radar penetration or zones characterized by en echelon fracturing.

6.2 Borehole radar versus tunnel mapping

123 oriented reflectors from borehole radar have been investigated. These comprise not only extensive radar reflectors, but also shorter ones. 45 reflectors were confidently correlated with 59 geological structures in the tunnel mapping at Äspö HRL. Of the 59 correlated geological structures, 48 are fractures, 7 are fracture zones and 3 are rock contacts (Table 6-10). Attention has been paid on FPIfractures and on fracture zones. 30 % of the FPI fractures and 83 % of the zones were detected by borehole radar (Table 6-11).

	Reflectors (no)	Reflectors with no correlations* (no)	Correlations (no)	Fractures correlated with reflectors (no)	Fracture zones correlated with reflectors (no)	Rock contacts correlated with reflectors (no)
KA0575A	11	2	11	8	2	
KA1061A	19	19	0	0		
KA1131B	8	8	ŋ	O		
KA1754A	13	13	0	0		
KA2048B	16	8	10		3	
KA2162B	16	4	15	14		
KA3191F	10	5	11	9	2	
C2 (KXZC2)	8	5	3	$\overline{2}$		
C3 (KXZC3)	11	8	3	3		
C6 (KXZC6)	11	6	6	5		
Total	123	78	59**	48		

Table 6-10. Summary of results from correlating oriented borehole radar reflectors with tunnel mapping (TMS). Only correlations of high confidence are included.

* Note: reflectors having correlations of medium or low confidence are included.

** Number of correlations can be greater than the difference between reflectors and reflectors with no correlations if a reflector can be confidently correlated with several structures.

The distribution of alpha angles of the oriented reflectors is similar to the distribution of alpha angles of other borehole radar reflectors (Figure 6-5). An explanation to the very few correlated reflectors with low alpha angle is that most do not crosscut the tunnel.

There appears to be a dominance of steeply dipping fractures with dip directions to the NNE or SSW and a few gently dipping fractures that all conform to the background data (Appendix 2d). However, there is also an important group of steeply-dipping fractures that dip to the WNW and some moderately dipping fractures that are not prominent in the background data. Fracture zones correlated with a reflector are steeply dipping towards W or NW and the few rock contacts that are correlated with reflectors are also steeply dipping but towards NW or SE.

The occurrence of fracture fillings (as mapped in the TMS-database) have been studied for all fractures correlated with an oriented radar reflector showing no greater difference from other fractures in the area (Figure A3a-11). FPI-fractures seem to contain more often epidote, grout or mylonite relative to all fractures in the area (Figure A3a-12). Calcite and grout seem to be overrepresented among FPIfractures captured by radar (n=25) relative to FPI-fractures not captured by radar (n=58), but in this group the number is too small for statistically valid conclusions.

Figure 6-5. Distribution of alpha angles of oriented borehole radar reflectors in boreholes at Äspö HRL. Number of data: ■=45, ■=78 ■=123.

Fractures in the tunnel giving rise to oriented radar reflectors generally more often contain water compared to other fractures (Table A5-4, Figures A5-1 and A5-2), but the overrepresentation of water bearing fractures could also be explained by the captured FPI-fractures of which about one half are water bearing. Fractures correlated with borehole radar are generally planar with a rough surface.

6.3 GPR versus tunnel mapping

51 GPR reflectors were investigated. Of these 28 reflectors (55 %) could be confidently correlated with mapped geology (Table 6-12). Out of the 28 correlated reflectors, 22 were correlated with fractures; 5 with rock contacts and one single to a fracture zone, which is also the only fracture zone in the tunnel. The rock contacts were in all cases contact between Äspö diorite and fine-grained granite (Table 6-13).

Some GPR-reflectors that were not correlated with geology could actually reflect fractures in the opposite tunnel wall, since the GPR-antenna was unshielded. The reflectors TASA-V-T1-17, TASA-H-T3-4, TASA-H-T3-11 and TASA-H-T3-12 are suspected reflectors from the opposite tunnel wall.

	TASA		TASZ		SUM	
Reflector property	No	3174-3245 m % of all	25-76 m No.	$%$ of all	No	$%$ of all
Reflectors	36		15		51	
Correlated reflectors	21	58	7	47	28	55
Non-correlated reflectors	15	42	8	53	23	45
Reflectors correlated with fractures	17	47	5	33	22	43
Reflectors correlated with fracture zones		3	0	0		2
Reflectors correlated with rock contacts	3	8	2	13	5	10

Table 6-12. Summary of results from correlation of GPR reflectors with tunnel mapping (TMS). Only correlations with medium or high confidence are encountered. Äspö HRL.

Table 6-13. Character of rock contacts with GPR reflector. Äspö HRL.

Nο	%	Rock contact Rock type 1	Rock type 2
5	100	Äspö-diorite	Fine-grained granite

The angle of the geological structure to the GPR profile is believed to be of importance for its visibility in the GPR-radargram. Figure A1-13 shows the distribution of alpha angles of the GPR reflectors that have been correlated with geology and those that have not been correlated with geology in relation to alpha angles of fractures in the area. The dataset is quite small but the preference for the GPR to catch structures lying at an angle of 30-50° to the profile is highlighted (see also Figure 6-6).

Due to the small data set no statistically valid conclusions can be made. The following statements do only count for the 22 fractures captured by GPR in this study. The fractures captured by GPR belong to the main fracture sets trending NW-SE or NE-SW with a dip of 70-90 (Appendix 2e). About half of the fractures captured by GPR are FPI-fractures. Horizontal fractures are absent, due to the fact that the GPR-profile is horizontal. The only fracture zone in the investigated area is oriented ~030/70 and it is also captured by GPR.

Calcite, epidote and grout seem to be overrepresented in fractures with GPR-reflector relative to background on behalf of chlorite (Figure A3a-13, Table A8-2) which supports the result from the study of borehole radar versus tunnel mapping.

Most fractures giving rise to a radar reflector are planar with a rough or smooth surface (Table A5-5). No difference between roughness of fractures with GPR-reflector relative to background have been noticed. Half of the fractures are water bearing, compared to only 12 % of background fractures. Of the 12 FPI fractures in the investigated tunnel interval, 9 were captured by GPR. The three FPIfractures that were not captured by GPR are characterized by no water content (Table A5-5), while the mineralogy is quite similar to those that have been captured by radar.

Figure 6-6. Alpha angles of GPR-reflectors to tunnel wall, Oskarshamn site investigation.

7 Conclusion

More than 80 % of the extensive oriented borehole radar reflectors could be confidently correlated with geology in the boreholes, while only 60 % of the oriented borehole radar and GPR reflectors could be confidently correlated with the tunnel mapping. Of the correlated reflectors in boreholes about 70 % are fractures (open fractures, sealed fractures, crushes or sealed fracture networks) and 30 % rock contacts, whereas of the correlated reflectors in the tunnel about 90 % are fractures or fracture zones and 10 % rock contacts. This means that only \sim 55 % of the oriented radar reflectors represent fractures, fracture zones or crushes in the bedrock.

Most possible deformation zones do have radar reflectors. Those which do not have any reflector are explained by poor radar penetration or no radar logging.

There is generally no outstanding property of fractures detected by radar, but the intersection angles of geological structures seem to be of importance whether this structure is registered by borehole radar or GPR or not. Fractures with intersection angles of 30-60° are generally slightly overrepresented in the radargrams relative to background.

The amount of data from each site was generally too small to make statistically valid conclusions about the properties of fractures giving rise to oriented radar reflectors. Looking at all sites together, the following can be stated:

- Fractures giving rise to a radar reflector was believed to belong to one of the main fracture sets. This study has not given any clear answer to this, since local fracture sets drown in the enormous amount of background data.
- Fracture mineralogy does not seem to be crucial for its visibility in the radargram.
- The most altered fractures are not captured by borehole radar. Fresh crushes are also not visible in radargrams, probably because they are actually artificial.
- The roughness of fractures with reflector is almost the same as for all fractures at the site in question. No clear preferred roughness is observed among fractures correlated with radar reflectors, except that irregular fractures are underrepresented. It should though be kept in mind that this straggling result may rather display differences in interpretation between mapping teams and not necessarily differences in properties (Gustafsson and Gustafsson 2007c, Section 4.3.4).
- Fractures and crushes giving rise to radar reflectors seem to be relatively thin. Many fractures correlated with reflectors are only about 0.5 mm wide. Crushes correlated with reflector are not the widest ones either (width only measured along borehole).
- In the correlation with tunnel mapping at Äspö HRL, water bearing fractures are overrepresented among fractures with borehole radar/GPR reflector. This overrepresentation of water bearing fractures is not observed in the correlations with borehole data (pfl-anomalies).
- Most fractures with kinematic indicators do not give rise to extensive radar reflectors.

8 Concluding remarks and recommendations

When planning the study and its delimitations, it seemed reasonable to concentrate on data from Forsmark, while the other sites served as a reference to observe which fracture properties related to radar reflectors may be site specific. Since the work with correlation is very time-consuming, the amount of data was also limited to extensive radar reflectors. This delimitation resulted in too few fracture data to make statistically valid conclusions about the fracture properties. However, this study has revealed that there is no outstanding property of fractures that matches radar reflectors. The study has also revealed that only \sim 55 % of the reflectors are explained by fractures, fracture zones or crush zones and that more than 20 % of the reflectors have no geological explanation.

Another feature in this study is the matter of scale and the difference in detail in the mapping of boreholes and tunnels. Several possible candidates were identified in the boreholes due to the very detailed borehole mapping. In the tunnel mapping, on the other hand, relatively few fractures are mapped and even fewer fractures are actually long enough to be probable candidates for the reflector. Approximately 5 sealed fractures/m are documented in the borehole mapping, while sealed fractures are generally not documented in the tunnel mapping. This explains why no sealed fractures in the Äspö HRL-tunnel are correlated with radar reflectors.

An important question concerns how the long fractures can be distinguished from all the other fractures in the pilot boreholes? It is clear that, if a fracture in the pilot borehole can be correlated with an extensive radar reflector, it is likely that the fracture is long. However there are quite often several possible candidates for one radar reflector and further studies are required to identify signatures for high confidence candidates. It can be concluded that 50-75 % of the long fractures (FPI) are captured by radar in the tunnel study at the Äspö HRL. Other methods need to be used to identify the remaining long fractures, for example, the modelling of long fractures between tunnels when the data assembly from tunnels has become sufficiently extensive.

The meaningless result from the study of mapped crush zones with no radar reflector reflects the need of defining crush better in the borehole mapping procedure. The mapped crush zones have very different character and the difference in character is not evident in the mapping data, as the mapping system is constructed today.

The oriented radar reflectors in the tunnel boreholes may, in some cases, have incorrect orientations which affect the correlation with geological structures negatively. The reason for this is that the borehole radar probe was not necessarily centralized in the boreholes during logging, and that the reflected incoming radar rays are diverging due to the amount of groundwater in the borehole surrounding the borehole radar probe. Technical developments that improve confidence in the orientation of radar reflectors are required.

9 Acknowledgements

The authors are very grateful to all who have contributed to this work: Isabelle Olofsson, Assen Simeonov, Michael Stephens, Stefan Sehlstedt, Leif Stenberg, Carljohan Hardenby, Oskar Sigurdsson, Johan Nissen, Elisabeth Djerf, Margareta Gerlach, and colleagues at our companies.

References

SKB's (Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB) publications can be found at www.skb.com/publications.

Carlsten S, 2004. Oskarshamn site investigation. Geological interpretation of borehole radar reflectors in KSH01, HSH01–03, KAV01 and KSH02. SKB P-04-218, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Carlsten S, Stanfors R, Askling P, Annertz K, 1995. Comparison between borehole radar data and geological parameters from tunnel mapping. SKB PR 25-95-22, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Döse C, Stråhle A, Rauséus G, Samuelsson E, Olsson O, 2008. Revision of BIPS-orientations for geological objects in boreholes from Forsmark and Laxemar. SKB P-08-37, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Gustafsson J, Gustafsson C, 2004a. Forsmark site investigation. RAMAC and BIPS logging in borehole KFM04A, KFM04B, HFM09 and HFM10. SKB P-04-67, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Gustafsson J, Gustafsson C, 2004b. Forsmark site investigation. RAMAC and BIPS logging in borehole KFM06A, HFM16, HFM17 and HFM19. SKB P-04-69, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Gustafsson J, Gustafsson C, 2004c. Forsmark site investigation. RAMAC and BIPS logging in borehole KFM05A. SKB P-04-152, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Gustafsson J, Gustafsson C, 2005a. Forsmark site investigation. RAMAC and BIPS logging in borehole KFM07A. SKB P-05-52, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Gustafsson J, Gustafsson C, 2005b. Forsmark site investigation. RAMAC and BIPS logging in borehole KFM08A. Revised April 2006. SKB P-05-158, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Gustafsson J, Gustafsson C, 2005c. Forsmark site investigation. RAMAC and BIPS logging in borehole KFM06C. SKB P-05-242, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Gustafsson J, Gustafsson C, 2006a. Forsmark site investigation. RAMAC and BIPS logging in boreholes KFM07B, KFM09A, HFM25 and HFM28. SKB P-06-44, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Gustafsson J, Gustafsson C, 2006b. Forsmark site investigation. RAMAC and BIPS logging in boreholes KFM09B, HFM24, HFM26, HFM27, HFM29 and HFM32. SKB P-06-64, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Gustafsson J, Gustafsson C, 2006c. Forsmark site investigation. RAMAC and BIPS logging in boreholes KFM08C, HFM30, HFM31, HFM33 and HFM34. SKB P-06-178, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Gustafsson J, Gustafsson C, 2006d. Oskarshamn site investigation. RAMAC, BIPS and deviation logging in boreholes KLX11B, KLX11C, KLX11D, KLX11E, KLX11F, KLX18A, KLX20A, HLX28 and HLX40 and BIPS and deviation logging in KLX19A. SKB P-06-159, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Gustafsson J, Gustafsson C, 2006e. Oskarshamn site investigation. RAMAC, BIPS and deviation logging in boreholes KLX13A, KLX14A, KLX22A, KLX22B, KLX23A, KLX23B, KLX24A, KLX25A, KLX26A, KLX26B, HLX39 and HLX41. SKB P-06-260, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Gustafsson J, Gustafsson C, 2007a. Forsmark site investigation. RAMAC and BIPS logging in borehole KFM11A. SKB P-07-10, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Gustafsson J, Gustafsson C, 2007b. Forsmark site investigation. RAMAC and BIPS logging in borehole KFM12A. SKB P-07-112, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Gustafsson J, Gustafsson C, 2007c. Oskarshamn site investigation. Radar, BIPS and deviation logging in borehole KLX15A. SKB P-07-117, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Gustafsson J, Gustafsson C, 2008a. Site investigation SFR. Radar and BIPS loggings in KFR101 and BIPS loggings in KFR27 (0–147 m), HFR101, HFR102 and HFR105. SKB P-08-71, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Gustafsson J, Gustafsson C, 2008b. Oskarshamn site investigation. RAMAC, BIPS and deviation logging in borehole KLX27A. SKB P-08-30, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Gustafsson J, Gustafsson C, 2009. Site investigation SFR. BIPS-logging in the core drilled boreholes KFR102A, KFR102B, KFR103, KFR104 and KFR27 (140–500 m) and radar logging in KFR27 (0–500 m), KFR102A and KFR104. SKB P-09-11, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Olsson O, 1992. Characterization ahead of the tunnel front by radar and seismic methods – a case history from the Äspö Hard Rock Laboratory. SKB PR 25-92-01, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

SKB, 1994. Supplementary investigations of fracture zones in the tunnel, core mapping and radar measurement. Compilation of technical notes. Measurements performed during construction of section 1 475–2 265 m. SKB PR 25-94-01, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Stephens M, Skagius K (eds), 2007. Geology – Background complementary studies. Forsmark stage modeling 2.2. SKB R-07-56, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Stephens, M, Fox A, La Pointe P, Simeonov A, Isaksson H, Hermansson J, Öhman J, 2007. Geology Forsmark. Site descriptive modeling – Forsmark stage 2.2. SKB R-07-45, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.

Wahlgren C-H, Curtis P, Hermanson J, Forssberg O, Öhman J, Fox A, La Pointe P, Drake H, Triumf C-A, Mattsson H, Thunehed H, Juhlin C, 2008. Geology Laxemar. Site descriptive modelling SDM-Site Laxemar. SKB R-08-54, Svensk Kärnbränslehantering AB.
Alpha angles of geological structures correlated with oriented extensive radar reflector relative to background

Figure A1-1. Alpha angles of extensive oriented reflectors correlated with open fractures (n=46) relative to alpha angles of all open fractures in investigated boreholes at Forsmark (n=13069) presented in %.

Alpha angles of reflectors correlated with sealed fractures relative to

Figure A1-2. Alpha angles of extensive oriented reflectors correlated with sealed fractures (n=31) relative to alpha angles of all sealed fractures in investigated boreholes at Forsmark (n=41543) presented in %.

Alpha angles of reflectors correlated with crush, relative to alpha angles of all crushes. Forsmark site investigation.

Figure A1-3. Alpha angles of extensive oriented reflectors correlated with crush (n=6) relative to alpha angles of all crushes in investigated boreholes at Forsmark (n=103) presented in %.

Alpha angles of reflectors correlated with contacts to rock occurrences relative to alpha angles of all rock occurrences. Forsmark site investigated.

Figure A1-4. Alpha angles of extensive oriented reflectors correlated with contacts to rock occurrences (n=43) relative to alpha angles of all rock occurrences in investigated boreholes at Forsmark (n=16676) presented in %.

Figure A1-5. Alpha angles of extensive oriented reflectors correlated with open fractures (n=9) relative to alpha angles of all open fractures in investigated boreholes at SFR (n=6375) presented in %.

Alpha angles of reflectors correlated with sealed fractures relative to

Figure A1-6. Alpha angles of extensive oriented reflectors correlated with sealed fractures (n=6) relative to alpha angles of all sealed fractures in investigated boreholes at SFR (n=11948) presented in %.

Alpha angles of reflectors correlated with crush, relative to alpha angles

Figure A1-7. Alpha angles of extensive oriented reflectors correlated with crush (n=1) relative to alpha angles of all crushes in investigated boreholes at SFR (n=100) presented in %.

Figure A1-8. Alpha angles of extensive oriented reflectors correlated with contacts to rock occurrences (n=6) relative to alpha angles of all rock occurrences in investigated boreholes at SFR (n=2864) presented in %.

Figure A1-9. Alpha angles of extensive oriented reflectors correlated with open fractures (n=17) relative to alpha angles of all open fractures in investigated boreholes at Oskarshamn (n=4289) presented in %.

Alpha angles of reflectors correlated with sealed fractures relative to alpha angles of all sealed fractures. Oskarshamn site investigation.

Figure A1-10. Alpha angles of extensive oriented reflectors correlated with sealed fractures (n=8) relative to alpha angles of all sealed fractures in investigated boreholes at Oskarshamn (n=7573) presented in %.

Alpha angles of reflectors correlated with crush relative to alpha angles of all crushes. Oskarshamn site investigation.

Figure A1-11. Alpha angles of extensive oriented reflectors correlated with crush (n=5) relative to alpha angles of crushes in investigated boreholes at Oskarshamn (n=35) presented in %.

Alpha angles of reflectors correlated with contacts to rock occurrences relative to alpha angles of all rock occurrences. Oskarshamn site investigaton.

Figure A1-12. Alpha angles of extensive oriented reflectors correlated with contacts to rock occurrences (n=11) relative to alpha angles of all rock occurrences in investigated boreholes at Oskarshamn (n=1288) presented in %.

Alpha angles of correlated and non-correlated GPR-reflectors relative to all fractures in investigated tunnel section, Äspö HRL

Figure A1-13. Distribution of GPR alpha angles correlated with geology/not correlated with geology relative to alpha angles of fractures in the investigated tunnel sections (measured as angle to tunnel mid-line). Number of data with correlated GPR-reflectors is 28, non-correlated GPR-reflectors: 23, and all fractures in investigated tunnel section: 228.

Stereographic projections showing oriented extensive radar reflectors in relation to main rock structures, Forsmark Site Investigation

Stereographic projections are on Schmidt net, lower hemisphere. Orientation data are poles to planes. Conventional contouring according to percentages. Non-weighted in-data.

Figure A2a-1. Oriented extensive radar reflectors that have been correlated confidently with mapped geology in KFM-boreholes (n=96, of which 1 may have two possible directions).*

* All poles to extensive radar reflector planes which are confidently correlated with geological structures are plotted.

Figure A2a-3. Contoured orientations of rock contacts (n=1619) in KFM-boreholes. ●=Rock contacts correlated with oriented extensive radar reflector (n=8)

*Figure A2a-2. Oriented extensive radar reflectors that have not been confidently correlated with mapped geology in KFM-boreholes (n=26, of which 8** have two possible directions).*

** All poles to extensive radar reflector planes which are not confidently correlated with geological structures are plotted.

Figure A2a-4. Contoured orientations of minor rock occurrences (n=16 676, upper contacts) in KFM-boreholes. ●=upper contacts to rock occurrences correlated with oriented extensive radar reflector (n=67).

Figure A2a-5. Contoured orientations of open fractures (n=13069) in KFM-boreholes. ●=Open fractures correlated with oriented extensive radar reflectors (n=43).

Figure A2a-6. Contoured orientations of crushes in KFM-boreholes, both upper and lower contacts (n=204). ●=Crushes correlated with oriented extensive radar reflector (n=6, both upper and lower contacts).

Figure A2a-7. Contoured orientations of crushes in KFM-boreholes, both upper and lower contacts* $(n=204)$. \bullet =crushes that have not been detected *by borehole radar (n=44, both upper and lower contacts).*

* Crushes with possible long/short oriented radar reflectors or non-oriented radar reflectors are not encountered.

Figure A2a-8. Contoured orientations of sealed fractures (n=41543) in KFM-boreholes. ●=Sealed fractures correlated with oriented extensive radar reflector (n=80).

Figure A2a-9. Contoured orientations of sealed fracture networks (n=1 740, Strike3Dip3-values) in KFM-boreholes. ●=Sealed fracture networks correlated with oriented extensive radar reflector (n=5).

Stereographic projections showing oriented extensive radar reflectors in relation to main rock structures, SFR Site Investigation

Stereographic projections are on Schmidt net, lower hemisphere. Orientation data are poles to planes. Conventional contouring according to percentages. Non-weighted in-data.

Figure A2b-1. Oriented extensive radar reflectors that have been confidently correlated with mapped geology in KFR-boreholes (n=15, of which one have two possible orientations).*

* All poles to extensive radar reflector planes which are confidently correlated with geological structures are plotted.

Figure A2b-2. Oriented extensive radar reflectors that have not been confidently correlated with mapped geology in KFRboreholes (n=1). Reflectors outside range of core mapping are excluded.

Figure A2b-3. Contoured orientations of rock contacts (n=331) in KFR-boreholes. No major rock contact is confidently correlated with any extensive radar reflector.

Figure A2b-4. Contoured orientations of minor rock occurrences in KFR-boreholes $(n=2860, upper contacts)$. $\bullet = Minor rock$ *contacts correlated with oriented extensive radar reflector (n=6).*

Figure A2b-5. Contoured orientations of open fractures (n=6831) in KFR-boreholes. ●=Open fractures and partly open fractures correlated with extensive oriented radar reflectors (n=18).

Figure A2b-6. Contoured orientations of crushes in KFR-boreholes, both upper and lower contacts (n=92). ●=Crush correlated with extensive oriented radar reflector (n=1).

Figure A2b-7. Contoured orientations of crushes in KFR-boreholes, both upper and lower contacs $(n=92)$. \bullet =crushes that have not been detected *by borehole radar* (n=40, both upper and lower contacts).*

* Crushes with possible long/short oriented radar reflectors or non-oriented radar reflectors are not encountered.

Figure A2b-8. Contoured orientations of sealed fractures (n=11483) in KFR-boreholes. ●=Sealed fractures correlated with extensive oriented radar reflector (n=8).

Figure A2b-9. Contoured orientations of sealed fracture networks (n=393, Strike3Dip3-values) in KFR-boreholes. No sealed fracture network is confidently correlated with any extensive radar reflector.

Stereographic projections showing oriented extensive radar reflectors in relation to main rock structures, Oskarshamn Site Investigation

Stereographic projections are on Schmidt net, lower hemisphere. Orientation data are poles to planes. Conventional contouring according to percentages. Non-weighted in-data.

Figure A2c-1. Oriented extensive radar reflectors that have been confidently correlated with mapped geology in KLX-boreholes (n=22, of which 3 have two possible orientations)*

* All poles to extensive radar reflector planes which are confidently correlated with geological structures are plotted.

*Figure A2c-2. Oriented extensive radar reflectors that have not been confidently correlated with mapped geology in KLX-boreholes (n=5).***

** If one of the interpreted reflector orientations is confidently correlated with a geological structure the other interpreted orientation is not encountered in this diagram.

Figure A2c-3. Contoured orientations of rock contacts (n=99) in KLX-boreholes. ●=Rock contact correlated with oriented extensive radar reflector (n=1).

Figure A2c-4. Contoured orientations of minor rock occurrences in KLX-boreholes (n=1288, upper contacts). ●=Minor rock occurrences correlated with extensive radar reflector (n=15).

Figure A2c-5. Contoured orientations of open fractures (n=4129) in KLX-boreholes. ●=Open fractures correlated with oriented extensive radar reflector (n=28).

Figure A2c-6. Contoured orientations of crushes in KLX-boreholes, both upper and lower contacts (n=71). ●=Crushes correlated with oriented extensive radar reflector (n=5, both upper and lower contacts plotted).

Figure A2c-7. Contoured orientations of crushes in KLX-boreholes, both upper and lower contacs $(n=71)$. \bullet =crushes that have not been detected by *borehole radar* (n=23, of which 14 are oriented, both upper and lower contacts).*

* Crushes / open fractures with apertures ≥ 1 mm with possible long/short oriented radar reflectors or nonoriented radar reflectors are not encountered.

Figure A2c-8. Contoured orientations of sealed fractures (n=7733) in KLX-boreholes. ●=Sealed fractures correlated with oriented extensive radar reflector (n=16).

Figure A2c-9. Contoured orientations of sealed fracture networks (n=175, Strike3Dip3-values) in KLX-boreholes. ●=Sealed fracture networks correlated with oriented extensive radar reflector (n=2).

Stereographic projections showing oriented extensive borehole radar reflectors in relation to main rock structures, Äspö hard rock laboratory

Stereographic projections are on Schmidt net, lower hemisphere. Orientation data are poles to planes. Conventional contouring according to percentages. Non-weighted in-data.

Figure A2d-1. Oriented extensive borehole radar reflector which have been confidently correlated with tunnel mapping (n=63).

Figure A2d-3. Contoured fracture orientations (n=2919) in investigated tunnel sections, Äspö. Fractures correlated with oriented extensive borehole radar reflector with high confidence $($ **•**, *n*=48) and with medium confidence $($ **•**, *n*=57).

Figure A2d-2. Oriented extensive borehole radar reflector which have not been confidently correlated with tunnel mapping (n=42)

Figure A2d-4. Contoured zone orientations (n=228) in investigated tunnel sections. ●=Fracture zones correlated with oriented extensive borehole radar (n=4). ●=Fracture zones not correlated with oriented extensive borehole radar (n= 1).*

* Several orientation measurements from the same zone are encountered.

Figure A2d-5. Contoured rock contact orientations (n=95) in investigated tunnel sections, Äspö. ●=Rock contacts correlated with oriented extensive borehole radar (n=2). ●=Rock contacts not correlated with borehole radar (n= 18).

Figure A2d-6. Contoured fracture orientations (n=2 919) in investigated tunnel sections, Äspö. ●=FPI- fractures (Full Perimeter Intersection) which have not been detected by extensive borehole radar (n=58). ●=FPI-fracture which have been detected by extensive oriented borehole radar (n=25).

Stereographic projections showing GPR reflectors in relation to main rock structures, Äspö hard rock laboratory

Stereographic projections are on Schmidt net, lower hemisphere. Orientation data are poles to planes. Conventional contouring according to percentages. Non-weighted in-data.

Figure A2e-1. Contoured fracture orientations (n=2919) in investigated tunnel sections, Äspö. ●=fracture correlated with GPR-reflector (n=21).* * Tunnel sections investigated by borehole radar are also included.

Figure A2e-3. Contoured fracture orientations (n=2919) in investigated tunnel sections, Äspö. ●=FPI-fracture** correlated with GPR-reflector (n=9). ●=FPI-fracture** which has not been correlated with GPR-reflector (n=3).*

* Tunnel sections investigated by borehole radar are also included.

** FPI-fracture = Full Perimeter Intersection fracture, which means it crosscut's the tunnel wall.

NOTE! Orientation data is missing for most rock contacts in the TMS-database in the investigated tunnel section and therefore no stereographic plots of correlated rock contacts were created.

Figure A2e-2. Contoured zone orientations (n=228) in investigated tunnel sections. ●=fracture zone correlated with GPR-reflector (n=1). Only one fracture zone exists in the tunnel sections measured with GPR.*

* Tunnel sections investigated by borehole radar are also included.

Mineralogy in fractures and crushes with oriented extensive radar reflectors relative to background presented in diagrams

Figure A3a-1. Mineralogy in open and partly open fractures with extensive oriented radar reflector (n=43) relative to background (n=13160), displayed as % of all fractures with the mineral in question. Non-weighted data.

Figure A3a-2. Mineralogy in sealed fractures with extensive oriented radar reflector (n=80) relative to background (n=41732), displayed as % of all fractures with the mineral in question. Non-weighted data.

Figure A3a-3. Mineralogy in crushes with extensive oriented radar reflector (n=6) relative to background (n=103), displayed as % of all fractures with the mineral in question. Note the very few crushes with reflector. Non-weighted data.

Mineralogy in sealed fracture networks with reflector relative to background. Site Investigation Forsmark.

Figure A3a-4. Mineralogy in sealed networks with extensive oriented radar reflector (n=5) relative to background (n=1818), displayed as % of all fractures with the mineral in question. Note the very few sealed networks with reflector. Non-weighted data.

Mineralogy in open and partly open fractures with reflector relative to background. Site Investigation SFR.

Figure A3a-5. Mineralogy in open and partly open fractures with extensive oriented radar reflector (n=18) relative to background (n=6909), displayed as % of all fractures with the mineral in question. Non-weighted data.

Figure A3a-6. Mineralogy in sealed fractures with extensive oriented radar reflector (n=8) relative to background (n=11605), displayed as % of all fractures with the mineral in question. Non-weighted data.

Mineralogy in open and partly open fractures with refelector relative

Figure A3a-7. Mineralogy in open and partly open fractures with extensive oriented radar reflector $(n=28)$ relative to background $(n=4211)$, displayed as % of all fractures with the mineral in question. *Non-weighted data.*

Mineralogy in sealed fractures with reflector relative to background. Site Investigation Oskarshamn.

Figure A3a-8. Mineralogy in sealed fractures with extensive oriented radar reflector (n=16) relative to background (n=7759), displayed as % of all fractures with the mineral in question. Non-weighted data.

Mineralogy in sealed fracture networks with reflector relative to background, Site Investigation Oskarshamn.

Figure A3a-9. Mineralogy in sealed fracture networks with extensive oriented radar reflector (n=2) relative to background (n=258), displayed as % of all fractures with the mineral in question. Note the very few amount of reflectors. Non-weighted data.

Figure A3a-10. Mineralogy in crushes with extensive oriented radar reflector (n=5) relative to background (n=48), displayed as % of all fractures with the mineral in question. Note the very few amount of reflectors. Non-weighted data.

Fillings in fractures with radar reflector relative to background, Äspö HRL

Figure A3a-11. Fillings in fractures with radar reflector relative to background, Äspö Hard Rock Laboratory. Number of data: ■=105, ■=48, ■=2 403. Non-weighted data.

Figure A3a-12. Fillings in FPI fractures with radar reflector relative to background (all mapped fractures within the investigated tunnel sections). Äspö Hard Rock Laboratory. Number of data: ■=25 ■=58 ■=2403. Non-weighted data.

Figure A3a-13. Fillings of fractures with GPR-reflector (n=22) relative to background (n=228), Äspö Hard Rock Laboratory. Non-weighted data.

Appendix 3b **Appendix 3b**

Mineralogy in fractures with oriented extensive radar reflector relative to background presented in tables **Mineralogy in fractures with oriented extensive radar reflector relative to background presented in tables**

Table A3b-1. Mineral occurrences in fractures with extensive radar reflector relative to background, Site investigation Forsmark (%). Non-weighted data. **Table A3b-1. Mineral occurrences in fractures with extensive radar reflector relative to background, Site investigation Forsmark (%). Non-weighted data.**

Äspö HRL	Reflector, medium & high confidence	Reflector, high confidence	FPI, reflector	FPI, no reflector	Background
TOT	105	48	25	58	2403
Biotite	0	0	0	2	0
Epidote	17	23	44	47	14
Fluorite	Ω	0	0	0	0
White feldspar	O	O	0	$\mathbf 0$	U
Calcite	48	50	76	57	50
Chlorite	46	50	52	43	60
Quartz	12 ²	8	16	10	4
Red feldspar	0	O	0	0	0
Pyrite	6	6	n	0	O
Sulphides	2	2	0	0	0
Clay minerals	U	O	4		3
Prehnite	0	0	0	0	0
Oxidized walls*	17	27	24	40	20
Grout*	5	4	32	14	2
Fine-grained granite*	2	2	0	0	
Pegmatite*	11	8	4	9	3
Mylonite*	2	2	12	17	

Table A3b-4. Fillings in fractures with extensive radar reflector relative to background, Äspö HRL (%). Non-weighted data.

* Fracture fillings/alterations that are not minerals.

* Fracture fillings/alterations that are not minerals.

Alteration of fractures with oriented extensive radar reflector relative to background

Table A4-1. Alteration of fractures with extensive radar reflector relative to background, non-weighted data. Site Investigation Forsmark.

* Expressed as percentage of all.

Table A4-2. Alteration of fractures with extensive radar reflector relative to background, non-weighted data. Site Investigation SFR.

* Expressed as percentage.of all.

Table A4-3. Alteration of fractures with extensive borehole radar reflector relative to background, non-weighted data. Site Investigation Oskarshamn.

* Expressed as percentage.of all.

Roughness of fractures with oriented extensive radar reflector relative to background

Table A5-1. Roughness of fractures with extensive radar reflector relative to background, non-weighted data. Site Investigation Forsmark.

* Expressed as percentage of all.

Table A5-2. Roughness of fractures with extensive radar reflector relative to background, nonweighted data. Site Investigation SFR.

* Expressed as percentage of all.

Table A5-3. Roughness of fractures with extensive radar reflector relative to background, non-weighted data. Site Investigation Oskarshamn.

* Expressed as percentage of all.

Table A5-4. Roughness of fractures captured by borehole radar relative to background, with emphasis on FPI-fractures. Äspö HRL. Non-weighted data.

* Expressed as percentage of all.

Roughness of FPI-fractures captured by borehole radar relative to background, Äspö HRL.

Figure A5-1. Roughness of FPI-fractures captured by borehole radar relative to background, Äspö HRL (data taken from Table A5-4). Non-weighted data.

Roughness of fractures captured by borehole radar relative to background, Äspö HRL.

Figure A5-2. Roughness of fractures captured by borehole radar relative to background, Äspö HRL (data taken from Table A5-4). Non-weighted data.
Table A5-5. Roughness of fractures captured by GPR and FPI-fractures not captured by GPR relative to background. Values as percentages. Non-weighted data. Äspö HRL.

Background TASZ-data (Section ID 64–81 m) and TASA (Section ID 3191–3240 m), Mappings Part P and T only.

Table A5-6. Width and apertures of fractures correlated with extended borehole radar reflectors. Background values in parenthesis. Non-weighted data.

Properties of crushes with no radar reflector

Figure A6-1. Mineralogy of crushes with no reflector (n=44) relative to background (n=103), Forsmark site investigation.

Figure A6-2. Mineralogy of crushes with no reflector (n=40) relative to background (n=47), SFR site investigation.

Mineralogy in crushes with no reflector relative to background Oskarshamn site investigation

Figure A6-3. Mineralogy of crushes with no reflector (n=23) relative to background (n=48), Oskarshamn site investigation.

	Forsmark		SFR		Oskarshamn	
Mineral	No radar $(n=44)$	Background $(n=103)$	No radar $(n=40)$	Background $(n=47)$	No radar $(n=23)$	Background $(n=48)$
Epidote	6.8	4.9	5.0	4.3	4.3	6.3
White feldspar	0.0	0.0	2.5	2.1	0.0	0.0
Graphite	0.0	0.0	2.5	2.0	0.0	0.0
Hematite	18.2	22.3	30.0	34.0	4.3	14.6
Calcite	56.8	62.1	35.0	34.0	69.6	81.3
Chlorite	77.3	80.6	67.5	70.2	95.7	95.8
Quartz	6.8	3.9	15.0	12.8	0.0	0.0
Muscovite	0.0	1.9	5.0	8.5	0.0	0.0
Unknown mineral	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	8.7	6.3
Pyrite	6.8	4.9	0.0	0.0	8.7	10.4
Sericite	2.3	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Talc	2.3	4.9	0.0	0.0	13.0	8.3
Sulphides	2.3	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Clay minerals	50.0	61.2	67.5	63.8	82.6	72.9
Laumontite	29.5	20.4	10.0	14.9	0.0	0.0
Zeolite	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.0	6.3
Prehnite	2.3	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Iron Hydroxide	2.3	1.0	7.5	8.5	0.0	4.2
Adularia	4.5	2.9	10.0	19.1	0.0	0.0
Oxidized walls	2.3	9.7	7.5	6.4	0.0	0.0

Table A6-1. Mineralogy of crushes with no reflector relative to background*.

* Numbers are percentages of crushes with the mineral in question.

Table A6-2 Alteration of crushes with extensive radar reflector relative to crushes with no reflector. Values are percentages and non-weighted. Note the very small amount of crushes with extensive radar reflectors.

Table A6-3. Width* of crushes with extensive radar reflector compared to crushes with no reflector. Non-weighted data.

* Width is expressed as cm along borehole. NOTE! Not as true widths.

Table A6-4. Number of mapped crushes with no radar reflector divided into real crushes and fracture zones/single fractures.

* A single thick fracture or a small fracture zone.

Table A6-5. Relation of upper and lower contact in crushes with extensive radar reflector relative to crushes with no radar reflector. Non-weighted data.

Possible deformation zones without extensive radar reflectors, Forsmark, SFR and Oskarshamn site investigations

Possible deformation zones with no radar reflector, Forsmark, SFR and Oskarshamn site investigations

granite (511058). Confidence level = 3.

13150801 LAXEMAR GE300 PLU KLX14A 2006-12-18 09:30:00 138,10 138,90 DZ5 3

Appendix 8

Properties of fractures correlated with radar reflectors (TMS data)

Table A8-1. Properties of fractures correlated with oriented borehole radar reflectors. Äspö HRL. Non-weighted data.

Table A8-2. Properties of fractures correlated with GPR reflector. Äspö HRL. Non-weighted data.

Grey marked columns are percentages of all reflectors.