Technical Data Information Report

RID Number	Transmitter	Transmitter Organization	Receiver	Receiver Organization	Keyword 1
7914.01	Walker	Nye County NWRPO	QARC	Nye County NWRPO	GWE

Document Date	11/18/2010	General Document Type	QA Program Doc	Keyword 2	Drilling
Entry Date	6/7/2011	Detail Document Type	Cuttings Sample Log	Keyword 3	Completion

Document Title/Subject Cuttings Sample Log Report for NC-GWE-GF-3PA.

Data Originator/Preparer Bob Wilcoxon, Jim Foster

Data Description Cuttings Sample Log Report for borehole NC-GWE-GF-3PA from ground surface to 609.1 ft, 7 pages, in Microsoft Word format. Report posted to the NWRPO website as RID7914_01.pdf.

Data Collection Method Reports generated from existing field Sample Cuttings Logs from NC-GWE-GF-3PA (See RID 7914).

Data Collection Location Not Applicable, generated from existing data.

Data Collection Period 11/18/2010 to 1/7/2011

Data Sources Sample Cuttings Logs from NC-GWE-GF-3PA (see RID 7914).

Data Censoring none

Data Processing Data from field Cuttings Sample Logs were entered into Microsoft Word forms for publishing.

Data Limitations This borehole was drilled with bucket augering methods from ground surface to 19.3 ft and conventional air rotary (air/foam) methods from 19.3 ft to the bottom of the borehole at 609.1 ft. These drilling methods produce disturbed samples that are considered reasonably representative of in situ conditions. The samples collected with the bucket auger method (surface to 19.3 feet) are disturbed but considered reasonably representative of in situ sediments limited by the following factors: 1) Dry and unconsolidated sediments in auger holes have a tendency to cave and result in mixing of the sediments within the borehole, and 2) It is difficult to determine the precise depth of the sample excavated and returned by an Auger Bucket. Samples collected below 19.3 ft to the bottom of the borehole at 609.1 ft using conventional air rotary (air/foam) drilling methods are also disturbed but considered reasonably representative of in situ conditions. As recognized in EWDP investigations (See discussions in EWDP Phase III Report (RID 5579, Sections 2.1 and 4), Phase IV report (RID 6801, Section 2.1.1.1)), rotary drilling pulverizes coarser components into finer particles and some of the in situ fines (silt and clay) are carried away in the drilling fluid (air discharge or returned injection water or formation water). These effects were minimized as much as possible during drilling operations. Consequently, the samples collected are biased toward the coarse fraction and are considered disturbed from in situ conditions. Losses to drilling fluid impact primarily the fines proportion of sediments sampled. These samples were used for production of a field Cuttings Sample Log, Cuttings Sample Log Report and a Summary Lithologic Log.

As a consequence of the sample bias introduced by conventional air rotary drilling methods, there are limitations inherent in certain parameters described on the Cutting Sample Log. The field estimates of particle size distribution are impacted because of the loss of fines to the drilling fluid as well as the increase of sand at the expense of gravel due to the pulverization of the coarser particles by the bit. Grading evaluations are considered reasonable because the recovered samples are considered representative, for the most part, of the in situ fractions of the sediments drilled preserved, thus allowing field personnel to make a determination. Unified Soils Classification System (USCS) classifications recorded on the Cuttings Sample Log Form are based on field estimates using ASTM D 2487-06 methods on cuttings that are returned and sampled, and the experience of the geologist logging the samples. Evidence of cementation is difficult to find in air rotary samples because of the grinding action of the bit; however, grain coatings of sand and fines were observed to be present on larger clasts in particular intervals indicating the presence of localized cementing agents present in the sediments. No limitation is assigned to sample reaction to 10% HCl as sample reaction is unaffected by air rotary drilling methods.

Sample lag time inherent in air rotary drilling methods introduces a small uncertainty in determining the proper time during the advancement of the borehole to collect each 5-foot sample interval specified on the Cuttings Sample Log Form (even 5-foot intervals). Sample lag time is a function of drilling fluid type (in this case air or air/foam), borehole diameter, and the annular area between drill pipe and borehole walls. These factors determine the up-hole velocity of the drilling fluid (and sample). Conventional air rotary uses large volumes of compressed air (up to 1000 cubic feet minute), resulting in large up-hole velocities and relatively small sample lag times. The depth intervals assigned to the samples on the Cuttings Sample Log form are therefore considered reasonably accurate.

Sampling was conducted in the following manner: For the interval drilled using augering methods (surface to 19.3 feet), five-foot sample intervals correlating to the intervals specified on the Cuttings Sample Log Form were marked on the auger stem. Cuttings Samples were collected from a cuttings pile after each auger bucket was brought to the surface and emptied on the ground. Care was taken to collect a reasonably representative sample of the interval. For samples collected by conventional air rotary methods (19.3 to 609.1 ft), five-foot sample intervals correlating to the intervals specified on the Drill Cuttings Logging Forms were marked on the drill pipe. As the drill string advanced downward and the beginning of each marked sample interval came into alignment with a measured reference feature, in this case the drilling table with known height above original ground surface, a 5-gallon plastic bucket labeled with the depth interval was positioned on the ground under the cyclone cuttings separator and drill cuttings were collected until the end of the interval marked on the drill pipe would intersect the drilling table. At this time the sample bucket was removed and replaced by an empty bucket to collect the next 5-foot interval. The cuttings were homogenized within the sample bucket by mixing with a metal scoop and care was taken to collect a reasonably representative sample of the mixture for logging purposes. It is not, however, possible to ensure that a perfect representation of in situ conditions was collected using this sampling method. A smaller sample was stored for archival purposes in 40 dram clear-plastic vials which were labeled with the sample interval. These samples were stored in plastic core boxes for future reference.

As noted in the logs, specific samples were impacted by drilling conditions. Poor sample recovery was noted for samples 160 to 170 ft, 175 to 185 ft, 195 to 200 ft, 210 to 215 ft, 235 to 240 ft, 265 to 270 ft, 300-305 ft, 340 to 350 ft, 365 to 370 ft, 445-450 ft, 480 to 485 ft and 595 to 609.1 ft (TD). Lost circulation zones were encountered at 243 ft and 315 ft.

Governing QA Docs:	TPN-5.6, Rev. 0
Frequency of Transmittal	Once per borehole/well.
Direct Questions About Data To:	NWRPO QA Records Center