

Opening the Tap on Hydrothermal Energy



Half our identified hydrothermal resources are simply not hot enough to make electricity by conventional geothermal technology. The Heber plant in southern California is demonstrating a binary-cycle approach that is custom-made for generating power from these medium-temperature brines.

One of the most important untapped sources of renewable energy for commercial power generation is the moderate-temperature hot water found in underground reservoirs in more than a dozen western states. Since this water is not hot enough for direct use in driving a turbine generator, EPRI has sponsored the adaptation of a binary-cycle geothermal technology to make these resources economically viable for producing electric power. The first large-scale demonstration power plant based on a binary cycle has now successfully completed its initial year of operation at Heber, California, and has begun to confirm some important advantages of the technology.

"The Heber project is on target in helping clarify the cost, performance, and environmental characteristics of binary-cycle power plants for utility application," says Vasel Roberts, manager of EPRI's Geothermal Power Systems Program. "Construction took only two years, and we now expect total project costs to be less than originally estimated."

With a net capacity of 46.6 MW(e), Heber is by far the largest binary-cycle plant ever built. The current test and demonstration period, to be completed in 1988, is expected to provide data and information that will establish the commercial feasibility of this technology—thereby providing utilities and developers with an important new option for power generation. In recognition of its importance, the Heber project won *Power* magazine's 1986 Electric Utility Energy Conservation Award.

Doubling recoverable energy

Most of the geothermal energy used for power generation now comes from reservoirs that produce dry steam. These resources are easy to tap but occur in only a few places. Electricity-grade hydrothermal resources contain about 10 times more energy than dry steam resources, but only about half of this water is hot

enough to be used directly in generating power. For high-temperature hydrothermal fluids, simply reducing the wellhead pressure causes part of the water to flash into steam, which can be used to drive a turbine. Such direct-flash hydrothermal technology is already being used for commercial power generation, both in the United States and in several other countries.

For most hydrothermal resources with moderate temperatures (150–210°C; 300–410°F), direct-flash technology may not be efficient enough to ensure economically competitive electric power generation. The efficiency of energy conversion can be increased, however, if a second fluid with a lower boiling point is used to drive the turbine. In such a binary cycle heat from the geothermal hot water is transferred to a hydrocarbon fluid, which vaporizes and passes through the turbine. An additional advantage of this configuration is that it uses about one-third less hot water to produce the same amount of electricity as a direct-flash unit.

Relatively small binary-cycle systems have been used for several years in industrial applications and in a few small hydrothermal facilities. A commercial-scale demonstration plant was needed to advance binary-cycle technology to maturity, to determine the economics of the technology, and to establish its environmental acceptability. The greatest challenge in scaling up this technology for utility use was the need for a hydrocarbon turbine approximately four times larger than any previously built.

With results from Heber's experience, utilities and project developers will soon be able to exploit moderate-temperature hydrothermal resources economically on a larger scale. Early studies for the Heber project, dating back to 1976, helped stimulate interest in binary-cycle technology, which led to plans for other plants. The Imperial Valley, where Heber is located, is particularly rich in hydrothermal resources and promises to become one of

the next major geothermal development areas in the United States. One new binary plant came on-line in the valley during 1986, and more have been announced for other sites.

"Commercial-scale use of moderate-temperature brines will almost double the amount of energy potentially recoverable from hydrothermal resources in the United States," says John Bigger, EPRI project manager for Heber. "At the present time, identified high-temperature resources could support about 12 GW of generating capacity through direct-flash plants with a lifetime of at least 30 years. Binary-cycle technology could add about 10 GW from moderate-temperature resources. By comparison, about 2 GW of dry steam resources have so far been developed."

Plant as good neighbor

The need for a large, commercial-scale binary-cycle demonstration plant was first identified at an EPRI workshop in 1974. After a long series of feasibility studies, conceptual design studies, and field experiments, construction began at the Heber site in June 1983. Two years later, almost to the very day, the first electricity from Heber was delivered to the distribution system of the Imperial Irrigation District (IID), in whose service territory the plant is located. The total cost of design, construction, and start-up for the new plant was \$128 million.

Because the plant is located amid some of the world's most productive agricultural land, in the Imperial Valley of southern California, it was important for the Heber facility to be a "good neighbor," says Vasel Roberts. This consideration has taken several forms. All brine removed from the underground hydrothermal reservoir, for instance, is pumped back into the reservoir to prevent subsidence of the land surface.

In addition, land use for the Heber plant was minimized by grouping all brine production wells together on a small site adjacent to the power plant

and drilling them obliquely in different directions. This production island is operated by Chevron Geothermal Co., which, together with Union Oil Co., owns the Heber geothermal resource. Eventually the Heber facility is expected to utilize 7.5 million lb of brine an hour (945 kg/s) from 13 production wells. The wells will be drilled to various depths—from 4000 to 10,000 ft (1220 to 3050 m)—to tap different portions of the underground reservoir. Full flow from all wells is now scheduled for mid-1987.

Brine is returned to the geologic formation at the periphery of the reservoir from an injection island situated 2.5 mi (4 km) northwest of the plant. This site has seven injection wells. By keeping the brine in a closed loop, the Heber power plant reduces the scaling and the atmospheric emissions that can result when brine is vaporized. Vaporization of brine inside the loop is prevented by keeping it under a pressure of 200 psig (1.38 MPa), which is maintained by pumps set down into the production wells at a depth of about 1000 ft (305 m). Each pump is driven by a long shaft attached to a 650-hp electric motor at the surface.

Finding a way to obtain cooling water is a major concern for most plants located in arid regions of the West. At the Heber facility water is needed to remove waste heat from the condensers that return the hydrocarbon working fluid to its liquid state after it passes through a turbine. Currently this cooling water is taken from a nearby irrigation canal, which is supplied from the Colorado River.

San Diego Gas & Electric Co. (SDG&E) is the host utility and project manager for Heber, operating the plant and sharing the generated power with IID. Other sponsors of the Heber binary project—which have provided substantial tech-

nical and financial support—are EPRI, Southern California Edison Co., the California Department of Water Resources, the state of California, and the U.S. Department of Energy. Additional contributors include Pacific Gas and Electric Co. and Magma Energy, Inc.

Innovations for performance

Several important technological innovations have been incorporated into the Heber plant and are demonstrating their readiness for utility application in the near future. Perhaps the most daring of these innovations is the world's largest hydrocarbon turbine. Rated at 95,000 hp, it was scaled up by a factor of four from previous models, with the initial design studies funded by EPRI.

At peak power more than 8.4 million lb of hydrocarbon fluid an hour (1060 kg/s) will flow through the turbine, which is connected to a generator with a rated capacity of 70 MW(e). About 23.4 MW(e) of power is required to run auxiliary equipment, including the brine production and injection pumps, so that the plant has a net output of 46.6 MW(e). At a commercial plant a utility would probably just purchase the brine, with no need for outside power to pump and reinject it.

Another significant innovation at Heber is a "floating" cooling system. Conventional, "fixed" cooling systems maintain a constant condensing temperature; this approach provides a constant power output from a plant but not always the greatest efficiency. Heber's floating cooling system operates continuously at full capacity, resulting in power output that varies with changes in ambient temperature—sometimes higher and sometimes lower than with a fixed system. This approach maximizes power production for any given atmospheric condition, thereby improving the plant's annual energy production and reducing brine requirements. The system's water is cooled by evaporation in a forced-draft tower, and makeup water from an adjacent irrigation canal is kept in two set-

ting ponds on the plant premises.

A third unique feature of the Heber plant is the use of a hydrocarbon working fluid mixture that was specially selected to match the thermodynamic characteristics of the hydrothermal resource and the site's ambient temperatures. After evaluating a number of fluids (including water) and conducting optimization studies, the project team chose a working fluid that contains 90% isobutane and 10% isopentane. This composition can be changed to compensate for a decline in brine temperature as time goes by or to match conditions at other geothermal fields. Four sets of pumps are used to circulate the working fluid, which can be removed from the power loop entirely and placed inside a 7100-barrel storage sphere.

A critical part of the Heber demonstration program is to show that flammable hydrocarbon fluids can be used safely in a power plant environment. Although utility personnel are accustomed to handling fuels, conventional plants normally use air or water as the working fluid. At Heber SDG&E is demonstrating that personnel can also be trained to work safely with flammable working fluids.


Finally, the Heber plant features an advanced distributed digital control system. Operators seated before three large color viewing screens can monitor and control any part of the plant through a system of computer graphics displays and keyboards. Because of the need for extensive data during Heber's test and demonstration program, the data acquisition system and the central computer are also connected to more than 800 sensors that continuously record conditions throughout the plant. These data will be critical in the design of future commercial binary-cycle plants.

Shakedown and testing

The testing emphasis during Heber's first year of operation was about equally divided between reservoir and plant. The purpose of the reservoir tests was to es-

Binary Basics

The binary-cycle process uses a secondary fluid loop to generate power from geothermal brines. Hot brine from a natural underground reservoir is pumped under pressure through a heat exchanger containing a hydrocarbon working fluid, which boils at a relatively low temperature. The fluid is vaporized by the brine's heat and the vapor fed through a turbine generator to produce electricity. The hydrocarbon fluid is then condensed for another cycle through the loop, and the cooled brine is pumped back into the geothermal reservoir.



Touring the Plant

Located in the Imperial Valley of southern California, the Heber project is by far the largest binary-cycle geothermal plant ever built.

1 The **production island** is the site of the hydrothermal wells, which pump hot water from as deep as 10,000 ft below the ground.


2 A bank of eight cylindrical **heat exchangers**, each weighing more than 200 tons, can handle a brine flow of over 2000 lb/s.

3 At 70-MW gross output, Heber's **hydrocarbon turbine** is over four times as large as any previously built.

4 Inside the **condensers**, returning the working fluid to liquid state requires the circulation of over 140,000 gal/min of cooling water.


5 A single spherical **storage tank** holds the entire 330,000-gal inventory of hydrocarbon fluid when the plant is shut down.





6 Heber's highly automated **control room** features color control and display screens that show plant status by means of computer graphics.



Demonstration Continues

The reams of performance data from Heber's more than 800 sensors will help in the design of future-generation geothermal plants. As shown below, plant operators found they were converting more energy from each pound of brine than predicted in the plant design. The plant's innovative cooling system also allows the generation of more electricity each year than with a conventional system.





establish production characteristics in order to plan the balance of the drilling program, estimate the reservoir's production capability, and determine the maximum acceptable reinjection pressures consistent with maintaining reservoir integrity. These tests also provided Chevron with data for validating its reservoir computer programs.

Inside the plant itself, the testing emphasis has been on establishing the base-

line performance of each major piece of equipment. Most of these equipment tests produced satisfactory results, and no significant degradation of performance has been noted in key plant components. Because of limited brine flow, maximum plant operation has not yet been demonstrated, but the excess capacity has enabled the plant to operate above its design capability. Two EPRI test engineers are at Heber participating in


the test program, which is expected to last two to three years.

After an initial six-month shakedown period, from June to December 1985, the plant compiled an excellent operating record—remaining on-line 93.3% of the time from January to June 1986. During this low-load test period, net energy of 14,831 MWh was produced.

During the first annual inspection, beginning in late June 1986, engineers

Tapping the Resource

Geothermal resources suitable for utility power generation are concentrated almost exclusively in the western states, with moderate-temperature brines about four times more common than high-temperature brines. Approximately 4700 MW of geothermal generating capacity is expected to be in place in the United States by 1995.



opened and inspected many of the major pieces of equipment. They were particularly pleased that no significant scaling or corrosion had occurred in the plant's eight large tube-and-shell heat exchangers, which transfer heat from the brine to the hydrocarbon fluid. "After conducting field tests and considering a number of candidate materials, project engineers selected a special high-chromium steel (A129-4C) for the tubing," says John Bigger, "and got even better results than we had hoped for." Estimates based on earlier field tests suggested that the heat exchangers might have to be cleaned as often as every six to eight months; after more than a year of operation, however, the tubing interiors were still so clean that maintenance crews simply closed the heat exchangers back up after inspection.

Some system failures are, of course, expected when a new plant begins operation, especially when innovative technologies are being tested for the first time. At Heber the most serious equipment breakdowns involved the booster pumps that pressurize and move the working fluid from condenser to heat exchanger. The units in question developed high levels of vibration when used with the hydrocarbon fluid, which is more compressible than conventional working fluids. Apparently because of this vibration and some problems with materials, the booster pumps experienced seal and bearing failures.

Several modifications were made to the pumps, including the substitution of different shaft material, seal coolants, and bearings. After these changes were completed, they were evaluated in a second shakedown period of about three months. Engineers at the plant and the vendor are continuing to study this issue. Since late November 1986, the Heber plant has remained on-line essentially full-time.

Future prospects

"Our job in EPRI's geothermal program is to make sure new technologies are avail-

able when utilities need them," says Vassel Roberts. "Right now, most of the western utilities with geothermal potential are not capacity-constrained, but we expect to see them ordering new plants, possibly in the 1990-1995 time frame. Quite likely, utilities will want to add new capacity in relatively small increments that can be brought on-line quickly. Heber is demonstrating that larger binary-cycle geothermal plants would be ideally suited to help meet these utility needs where moderate-temperature hydrothermal resources are available."

Generating capacity based on geothermal resources of all types is expected to expand rapidly over the next few years. According to projections of the North American Electric Reliability Council, this capacity will grow at an annual rate of nearly 8.6% in the next decade. EPRI surveys of utilities show a probable total geothermal generating capacity of 4700 MW by 1995, up from 2115 MW in 1986.

With the development of the binary cycle and other technologies, utilities will have considerable leeway in matching plant technology to resource characteristics for optimum performance. A binary-cycle plant will be the clear choice for resource temperatures up to about 176°C (350°F). In the temperature range of 176-210°C (350-410°F), either binary or flashed-steam technology could be considered. The choice would be determined by a number of factors, including reservoir productivity, mineral and gas content of the geothermal fluid, environmental considerations, and economics. Above 210°C (410°F) binary cycles can still be considered but will probably give way to direct flash.

Three direct-flash options are now available: single-stage and two-stage systems and a system that features rotary separator-turbine (RST) augmentation. Already a two-stage direct-flash unit is generating power commercially with 182°C (360°F) water from the same reservoir that supplies the Heber binary proj-

ect. The development of RST technology, now being pursued by EPRI, could further enhance the performance of direct-flash units over the temperature range for which they are suitable.

The demonstration of the binary cycle in utility application should open up the commercial potential of lower-temperature brines for the first time. The first commercial binary units are expected to range in size from 5 to 50 MW(e). Utilities are expected to favor the larger units, which will require hot water from several wells; but the smaller, "wellhead" units, which use the flow of only one or a few adjacent wells, will still be needed.

Capital costs for the first commercial binary plants similar to Heber are expected to run around \$1650/kW(e), not including reservoir development, according to John Bigger. "Their competitiveness with plants based on other new technologies will depend largely on the cost of delivered brine, which usually comes from non-utility-owned wells. At full capacity the project expects to pay \$1.15 per million Btu for hydrothermal energy, or about the equivalent of oil at \$20 a barrel. At that rate, one might expect the busbar electricity cost from a commercial binary plant to be 83 mills per kWh."

That figure could change significantly, Bigger says, depending on the specific contract between a utility and the owner of a hydrothermal resource. In any case, he concludes, "The Heber demonstration program is showing that larger binary-cycle plants will be technically ready for commercial orders once the appropriate market conditions exist." ■

This article was written by John Douglas, science writer. Technical background information was provided by Vassel Roberts and John Bigger, Advanced Power Systems Division.

INTRODUCTION

by

Phillip Michael Wright

Geothermal energy is heat that originates within the earth. At our current stage of technology, economic development of geothermal heat can be accomplished in a few areas where the heat is concentrated by geological processes. Approximately 4,733 megawatts of electricity (MWe) are currently being generated in 17 countries from geothermal energy, and about 10,000 thermal megawatts (MWT) are being used for direct heat applications. The United States produces 2,006 MWe of electrical power and uses 400 MWT in direct applications. While this is small compared to our use of an estimated 8.4 million MW of fossil energy (1), it nevertheless saves the consumption of 111 million barrels of oil per year worldwide and 35 million barrels per year in the U.S.

It is difficult to estimate the ultimate potential contribution of geothermal energy to mankind's needs for three reasons: 1) future energy costs are uncertain, and many lower-grade geothermal resources would become economic at higher energy prices; 2) only preliminary estimates of the worldwide resource base have been made, and; 3) technology is not yet available for using magma, hot rock and normal thermal-gradient resources, whose potential contributions are large.

The Earth's Internal Heat

Many large-scale geological processes are powered by redistribution of internal heat as it flows from inner, hotter regions to outer, cooler regions. Although the variations with depth in the earth of density, pressure and seismic velocity are well known, the temperature distribution is uncertain. We know that temperature within the earth increases with increasing depth (Figure 1), at least for the first few tens of kilometers, and we hypothesize a steadily increasing temperature to the earth's center. Plastic or partially molten rock at temperatures between 700 deg C and 1,200 deg C is postulated to exist everywhere beneath the earth's surface at depths of 100 km, and the temperature at the earth's center, nearly 6,400 km deep, may be more than 4,000 deg C.

Because the earth is hot inside, heat flows steadily outward and is permanently lost by radiation into space. The mean value of surface heat flow is 82 E-3 watts/m^2 . Since the surface area of the earth is 5.1 E+14 m^2 , the rate of heat loss is about 42 million megawatts (1). White (2) estimates the total thermal energy above surface temperature to a depth of 10 km at 1.3 E+27 J , equivalent to burning 2.3 E+17 barrels of oil. The outward heat flux is about 5000 times smaller than the flux of solar heat, and the earth's surface temperature is, thus, controlled by

the sun and not by internal heat (3).

Two sources of internal heat are most important among several contributing alternatives: 1) heat released throughout the earth's 4.7 billion-year history by decay of radioactive isotopes of uranium, thorium, potassium and other elements; and, 2) heat released during formation of the earth by gravitational accretion and during subsequent mass redistribution when heavier material sank to form the earth's core. The relative contribution to the surface heat flow of these two mechanisms is not resolved.

GEOLOGICAL PROCESSES

The genesis of geothermal resources lies in the geological transport of anomalous amounts of heat near enough to the surface for access. Thus, the distribution of geothermal areas is not random but is governed by geological processes of global, regional and local scale. Figure 2 shows the principal areas of known geothermal occurrences on a world map. Also indicated are areas of young volcanos and currently active geological structures. It is readily observed that geothermal resources occur in areas that have volcanic and other geological activity.

Geothermal resources commonly have three components: 1) an anomalous concentration of heat, i.e. a heat source; 2) fluid to transport the energy from the rock to the surface; and, 3) permeability in the rock for the plumbing system. We will consider these elements in turn.

Heat Sources

In geothermal areas, higher temperatures are found at shallower depths than is normal. This condition usually results from either 1) intrusion of molten rock from great depth to high levels in the earth's crust, 2) higher-than-average surface heat flow, with an attendant high temperature gradient with depth (Figure 1), 3) ascent of ground water that has circulated to depths of 2 to 5 km, or 4) anomalous heating of shallow rock by decay of radioactive elements. Most high-temperature resources appear to be caused by the first mechanism.

A schematic cross section of the earth is shown in Figure 3. A solid layer, the lithosphere, extends from the surface to a depth of about 100 km. The lithosphere is composed of an uppermost layer called the crust and of the uppermost regions of the mantle, which lies below the crust. Mantle material below the lithosphere behaves plastically, flowing very slowly under sustained stress. The crust and mantle are composed of minerals whose chief building block is silica (SiO_2). The outer core is believed to be composed of a liquid iron-nickel-copper mixture while the inner core is a solid mixture of these metals.

Plate Tectonics. One geological process that generates shallow crustal heat sources in several different ways is known as plate tectonics (Figure 4). Outward heat flux from the deep interior is hypothesized to form convection cells in the mantle in which hotter material slowly rises, spreads out under the solid lithosphere, cools and descends again. The lithosphere cracks above areas of upwelling and is dragged apart along arcuate structures called "spreading centers", or "rift zones". These spreading plate boundaries are typically thousands of kilometers long, several hundred kilometers wide and coincide

with the world's mid-oceanic mountain system (Figures 2 and 4). Crustal plates on each side of the rift separate a few centimeters per year, and molten mantle material rises in the crack, where it solidifies to form new crust. The upwelling of molten material brings large quantities of heat to shallow depths.

The laterally moving plates press against adjacent plates, some of which contain the imbedded continental land masses, and in most locations the oceanic plates are thrust beneath the continental plates. These zones of under-thrusting, where crust is consumed, are called "subduction zones". They are marked by the world's deep ocean trenches, formed as the sea floor is dragged down by the subducted oceanic plate.

The subducted plate descends into the mantle and is warmed by the surrounding warmer material and by frictional heating. At the descending plate's upper boundary, temperatures become high enough in places to cause partial melting. The molten or partially molten rock bodies (magmas), ascend buoyantly through the crust (Figures 4 and 5) along zones of structural weakness, carrying their heat to within 1.5 to 20 km of the surface. They give rise to volcanos if part of the molten material escapes to the surface through fractures. Since the subducted plate descends at an angle of about 45 degrees, crustal intrusion and volcanos occur on the landward side of oceanic trenches 50 to 200 km inland. This process causes the volcanos in the Cascade Range of California, Oregon and Washington, for example, and in many other parts of the globe as well.

Figure 1 shows where these processes of spreading, formation of new oceanic crust and subduction of oceanic plates are currently operating. Oceanic rises, where new crustal material is formed, occur in all major oceans. The East Pacific Rise, the Mid-Atlantic Ridge and the Indian Ridges are examples. In places, the ridge crest is offset by large faults that result from variations in the rate of spreading along the ridge. Such faults are called "transform faults".

Magmatic Intrusions and Intrusive Rocks. An ascending body of molten material may cease to rise at any level in the earth's crust and may or may not vent through erupting volcanos (Figure 5). Intrusion of magmas into the upper crust has occurred throughout geologic time. We see evidence for this in the occurrence of volcanic rocks of all ages and in the small to very large areas (hundreds of square miles) of crystalline, granitic rock, now exposed at the surface by erosion, that result when magmas cool slowly at depth.

Volcanic rocks extruded at the surface and crystalline rocks that have cooled at depth are known collectively as igneous rocks. They have a range of chemical and mineral compositions. At one end of the compositional range are rocks that are

relatively poor in silica (SiO_2 about 50%) and relatively rich in iron ($\text{Fe}_2\text{O}_3 + \text{FeO}$ about 8%) and magnesium (MgO about 7%). The volcanic variety of this rock is basalt and an example can be found in the rocks that compose the Hawaiian Islands. At the other end of the range are rocks that are relatively rich in silica (SiO_2 about 64%) and poor in iron ($\text{Fe}_2\text{O}_3 + \text{FeO}$ about 5%) and magnesium (MgO about 2%). The volcanic variety of this rock, rhyolite, is usually lighter in color than black basalt and occurs mainly on land. The plutonic variety is granite. Magmas that result in basalt are termed "mafic" or "basic" whereas magmas that result in rhyolite or granite are termed "felsic" or "acidic".

The upper portions of the mantle are believed to be basaltic in composition. The great outpourings of basalt found on the ocean ridges and in places like the Hawaiian Islands seem to indicate a more or less direct pipeline from the upper mantle to the surface.

The origin of granites is a subject of controversy. Felsic magma can be derived by progressive segregation of the melt fraction from a basaltic magma as it cools and begins to crystallize. However, the chemical composition of granites is much like the average composition of the continental crust, and some granites also result from melting of crustal rocks due to heating by upwelling basaltic magmas. Basaltic magmas melt at a higher temperature and are more fluid than granitic magmas. Occurrence of felsic volcanic rocks of very young age (less than 1 million years and preferably less than 50,000 years) is a sign of good geothermal potential in an area because they may indicate a large body of viscous magma at depth to provide a strong heat source. On the other hand, occurrence of young basaltic rocks is not as encouraging because the basalt, being fairly fluid, could simply ascend along narrow conduits from the mantle directly to the surface without need for a shallow magma chamber (4).

Mantle Plumes. Another important source of volcanic rocks are point sources of heat in the mantle. It has been hypothesized that the upper mantle contains local areas of upwelling, hot material called "plumes". As crustal plates move over these hot spots, a linear or arcuate sequence of volcanos is developed. Young volcanic rocks occur at one end of the chain with older ones at the other end. The Hawaiian Island chain is an example. The youngest volcanic rocks on the island of Kauai on the northwest end have been dated through radioactive means at about 4 million years, whereas the volcanos Mauna Loa and Mauna Kea on the island of Hawaii at the southeast end of the chain are forming today and are in almost continual eruptive activity. To the northwest, the Hawaiian chain continues beyond Kauai for more than 2,000 miles to Midway Island, where the last volcanic activity was about 16 million years ago. The trace of the island chain is consistent with the motions of the Pacific plate as postulated by geophysicists from other data.

Thin Crust. Not all geothermal resources are caused by near-surface intrusion of molten rock bodies. Certain areas have a higher than average rate of increase in temperature with depth (high geothermal gradient) without shallow magma being present. Much of the western United States contains areas that have an anomalously high heat flow (100 E-3 watt/m^2) and an anomalously high geothermal gradient (40 to 60 deg C/km). The typical geothermal gradient in the continental interior is 20 to 30 deg C/km. In the West, geologic evidence suggests that the crust is thinner than normal, accounting for upwarping of mantle isotherms and high measured geothermal gradients.

Fluids

For geothermal resources to be developed economically, an efficient means of bringing large quantities of heat to the surface is needed. Fortunately, nature provides water, which normally pervades fractures, pores and other open spaces in rocks. Water has a high heat capacity and a high latent heat of vaporization. Thus, it is an ideal heat-transfer fluid.

The density and viscosity of water both decrease as temperature increases. Water heated at depth is lighter than cold water in surrounding rocks, and is therefore subjected to buoyant forces. If heating is great enough for buoyancy to overcome the flow resistance of the rock, heated water will rise toward the earth's surface. As it rises, cooler water moves in to replace it. In this way, natural convection is set up in the groundwater around and above a source of heat such as an intrusion. Convection brings large quantities of heat within the reach of wells, and is, thus, responsible for the most economically important class of geothermal resources, the convective hydrothermal resources.

In some convective hydrothermal resources, the temperature never reaches the boiling point because of rapid water flux, and the system does not generate steam. However, in other systems pressure release (perhaps through sudden venting) causes the local boiling point to be reached, and steam is produced. The steam ascends and meets cooler rocks where it partially condenses while heating the rocks, and the pressure drop due to condensation brings up more steam. In this way, steam convection is set up. If venting exceeds recharge, the steam zone grows and steam will accumulate in the reservoir. The temperature and pressure in such a steam reservoir vary slowly with depth. At Larderello, Italy, the reservoir temperature and pressure are 240 deg C and 35 bars, values that appear to be typical of other vapor-dominated systems.

Permeability

Permeability is a measure of a rock's capacity to transmit fluid as a result of pressure differences. The flow takes place in pores between mineral grains and in open spaces created by fractures and faults. Porosity is the term given to the fraction of void space in a volume of rock. Interconnected porosity provides flowpaths for the fluids, and creates permeability, although there is no simple relationship between porosity and permeability.

Permeability and porosity can be primary or secondary, i.e. formed with the rock or subsequently. Primary permeability in sedimentary rocks originates from intergranular porosity and it usually decreases with depth due to compaction and cementation. In volcanic sequences, primary intergranular porosity and permeability exist, but primary permeability also exists in open spaces at contacts between individual flows and within the flows themselves. Secondary permeability occurs in open fault zones, fractures and fracture intersections, along dikes and in breccia zones produced by hydraulic fracturing (5) and (6). Permeabilities in rocks range over 12 orders of magnitude. Permeabilities in pristine, unfractured crystalline rock are commonly on the order of $E-6$ darcy or less. However, in-situ measurements at individual sites may vary by as much as 4 to 6 orders of magnitude, and zones of >100 millidarcy are commonly encountered. These higher permeabilities are due to increased fracture density.

Most geothermal systems are structurally controlled, i.e. the magmatic heat source has been emplaced along zones of structural weakness in the crust. Permeability may be increased around the intrusion from fracturing and faulting in response to stresses involved in the intrusion process itself and in response to regional stresses. Thus, an understanding of the geologic structure in a resource area can lead not only to evidence for the location of a subsurface magma chamber, but also to inferences about areas of higher permeability at depth. Such areas would be prime geothermal exploration targets. Regarding exploration for hydrothermal systems, the key problem appears to be more in locating permeable zones than in locating high temperatures. Fractures sufficient to make a well a good producer need be only a few millimeters in width, but must be connected to the general fracture network in the rock in order to sustain large fluid volumes.

CLASSIFICATION OF GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES

Geothermal resources can be classified as shown in Table 1, modeled after White (7). To describe resources, we resort to simplified geologic models. A given model is often not acceptable in all details to all geologists. In spite of disagreement over details, however, the models presented below are generally acceptable and facilitate our thinking.

Geothermal resource temperatures range upward from the mean annual ambient temperature (10 to 30 deg C) to over 350 deg C (Figure 6). For convenience, geothermal temperatures are arbitrarily divided into high, intermediate or moderate, and low temperatures, corresponding to the ranges $T > 150$ deg C, $90 < T < 150$ deg C, and $T < 90$ deg C, respectively.

Convective Hydrothermal Resources

Convective hydrothermal resources are geothermal resources in which the earth's heat is carried upward by convective circulation of naturally occurring hot water or steam. Underlying some high-temperature hydrothermal resources is presumably an intrusion of still-molten or recently solidified rock whose temperature ranges between 300 and 1,100 deg C. Other convective resources result from circulation of water down fractures to depths where the rock temperature is elevated even in the absence of an intrusion, with heating and buoyant transport of the water to the surface.

Vapor-Dominated Systems. Figure 7 shows a conceptual model of a hydrothermal system where steam is the pressure-controlling fluid phase, a so-called "vapor-dominated" geothermal system (8). Convection of deep saline water brings heat upward to a level where boiling can take place. Boiling removes the latent heat of vaporization, thereby cooling the rock and water and allowing more heat to rise from depth. Steam moves upward through fractures and is possibly superheated by the hot surrounding rock. At the top and sides of the system, heat is lost from the vapor and condensation results, with the condensed water moving downward to be vaporized again. Within the vapor-filled part of the reservoir, temperature is nearly uniform due to rapid steam flux. If an open fracture penetrates to the surface, steam may vent or may heat the shallow ground water to boiling. Pressure within the reservoir is controlled by the vapor phase and increases slowly with depth. Because the surrounding rocks typically contain ground water under hydrostatic pressure, a large horizontal pressure differential exists between the steam in the reservoir and the water in adjacent rocks, and a significant question revolves around why the adjacent water does not move in and inundate the reservoir. We postulate that permeability at the boundaries of the reservoir is low either as

a result of pre-existing geological features such as impermeable beds or faults, or that it has been decreased by deposition of minerals in the fractures and pores to form a sealed zone. The formation of a vapor-dominated system appears to require venting of steam at a rate in excess of water recharge to prevent flooding of the reservoir (8).

Vapor-dominated systems may be formed from pre-existing water-dominated systems through special geological conditions. In fact, a hydrothermal system that is basically water dominated can have one or more natural zones which are vapor dominated, and vapor-dominated zones can result from production of fluids from a well if local water recharge is insufficient to keep pace with production.

The Geysers geothermal area in California is an example of this type of resource. Other producing vapor-dominated resources occur at Lardarello and Monte Amiata, Italy, and at Matsukawa, Japan.

Water-Dominated Systems. Figure 8 illustrates a high-temperature, hot-water dominated geothermal system. Models for such systems have been discussed in references (8), (9), (10), and (11), among others. The heat source is probably molten rock or rock that has solidified only in the last few tens of thousands of years, lying at a depth of perhaps 3 to 10 km. Ground water circulates downward in open fractures and removes heat from these deep, hot rocks. Rapid convection produces uniform temperatures over large volumes of the reservoir. In some places, boiling may occur and a two-phase region may exist, but the pressure is controlled by water. Recharge takes place at the margins. Escape of hot fluids is often minimized by a near-surface sealed zone or cap-rock formed by precipitation of minerals in fractures and pore spaces. Surface manifestations include hot springs, fumaroles, geysers, travertine deposits, chemically altered rocks, or alternatively, no surface manifestation at all. If there are no surface manifestations, discovery is difficult and requires sophisticated geology, geophysics, geochemistry and hydrology.

Isotopic studies of hydrothermal fluids show that the bulk of the water and steam is derived from meteoric water (rain or snow), with the exception of those few systems where the fluids are derived from seawater or connate brines (12). Only a small percentage of the water comes from the intrusive rocks at depth. As the fluids move through the reservoir rocks, the compositions of both the fluids and the rocks are modified by the dissolution of primary minerals and the precipitation of secondary minerals. The entire hydrothermal convection system (rocks and fluids) is, in fact, a large-scale chemical reactor with interactions that are not completely understood today. The waters generally become enriched in NaCl and depleted in Mg. Salinities of high-temperature geothermal fluids range from less than 10,000 ppm total dissolved solids in some volcanic systems to over 250,000

ppm total dissolved solids in basin environments such as the Salton Sea, California (13) and (14). Table 2 shows some typical chemical analyses for hydrothermal fluids.

The pressure and temperature in most high-temperature hydrothermal convection systems lie near the curve of boiling point versus depth for saline water, and sporadic, local boiling occurs in many systems. Because boiling concentrates acidic gases (CO₂ and H₂S) in the steam, the oxygenated meteoric water overlying a boiling reservoir is heated and acidified. These acidic waters interact with the near-surface rocks to form certain hydrothermal minerals, typically clays, that can be used to help locate zones of subsurface boiling.

Hydrothermal Reservoirs. At this point, it is desirable to discuss the term "reservoir". The reservoir is the volume containing hydrothermal fluids at a useful temperature. The porosity of the reservoir rocks determines the total amount of fluid available, whereas the permeability determines the rate at which fluid can be produced. One must not envisage a large bathtub of hot water that can be tapped at any handy location, however. Both porosity and permeability vary over wide ranges at different points in the reservoir. A typical well encounters tight, hot rocks with steam or hot water inflow mainly along a few open fractures or over a restricted stratigraphic interval. Apertures of producing fractures may be as little as a few millimeters. Areas where different fracture or fault sets intersect or where fractures intersect favorable stratigraphic units may be especially favorable for production of large volumes of fluid. The longevity of a well depends upon how completely the producing zones are connected to the local and reservoir-wide network of porosity. If this inter-zone permeability is poor, the local open spaces are drained quickly and fluid production drops. However, if the well intersects a thoroughgoing geologic structure such as a major fault or fracture, the local producing volume around the well is recharged continuously, and fluid production can be maintained for many years.

Virtually all of industry's geothermal exploration effort in the United States is presently directed at locating vapor- or water-dominated hydrothermal systems having temperatures above 200 deg C. A few of the highest grade resources are capable of commercial electrical power generation today, and the majority of the growth in geothermal energy production is expected to come from hydrothermal resources until well into the next century.

Intermediate- and Low-Temperature Systems. The fringe areas of high-temperature vapor- and water-dominated hydrothermal systems often produce water of low and intermediate temperature. These lower-temperature fluids are suitable for direct-heat applications and may also be used for electrical power production as new binary technology becomes available. Low- and intermediate-temperature waters can also result from deep water circulation in areas where heat conduction and the geothermal

created fracture system and its thermal drawdown and rate of water loss. Hot dry rock energy may contribute to our energy mix in the 1990s or in the next century.

Molten Rock (Magma) Resources

Experiments are underway at the Department of Energy's Sandia National Laboratories in Albuquerque, New Mexico to learn how to extract heat energy directly from molten rock. Techniques for locating a shallow, crustal magma body, drilling into it and implanting heat exchangers or possibly direct electrical converters are being developed (20). In Iceland, where geothermal energy was first used for space heating in 1928, technology has been demonstrated for economic extraction of thermal energy from young lava flows (21). A heat exchanger constructed on the surface of the 1973 lava flow on Heimaey recovers steam which results from downward percolation of water applied at the surface above hot portions of the flow. A space heating system which uses this energy has been operating successfully for over ten years.

GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES IN THE UNITED STATES

Figure 12 displays the distribution of known geothermal resources in the United States. Information for this figure was taken mainly from Muffler et al. (22) and Reed (23). Not shown are locations of hot dry rock or magma resources because very little is known. In addition, it should be emphasized that the present state of knowledge of geothermal resources of all types is poor.

Most of the hydrothermal resources and all of the presently known resources capable of electric power generation occur in the West. Large areas underlain by warm waters in sedimentary rocks exist in Montana, North and South Dakota, and Wyoming (the Madison Group of aquifers). Another important large area of low-temperature water is the north east-trending Balcones zone in Texas. The geopressured resource areas of the Gulf Coast and surrounding states are also shown. Resource areas indicated in the eastern states are highly speculative. Low temperature resources are much more plentiful than are high-temperature resources. Muffler et al. (22) conclude that the cumulative frequency of occurrence increases exponentially as reservoir temperature decreases, at least down to 90 deg C (Figure 13).

Let us consider the known geothermal occurrences in a bit more detail, beginning in the Western U. S. Figure 14 shows a physiographic map of the U.S. to help in locating the areas discussed, and Table 3 lists the geologic time scale.

Salton Trough/Imperial Valley, CA

The Salton Trough lies along the landward extension of the Gulf of California. It is composed of the Imperial Valley in the U.S. and the Mexicali Valley in Mexico. The area is one of complex, currently active plate tectonic processes. The crest of the East Pacific Rise spreading center is offset repeatedly northward up the Gulf of California by transform faulting (Figure 2). Both the rise crest and the transform faults come onto the continent under the delta of the Colorado River (Figure 15) and the structure of the Salton Trough suggests that they underlie the trough.

The Salton Trough has been an area of subsidence since Miocene times. Sedimentation in the trough has paced subsidence, with debris from the Colorado River predominating. At present, 3 to 5 km of poorly-consolidated sedimentary material overlie a basement of Mesozoic crystalline rocks that intruded Paleozoic and Precambrian sedimentary rocks. Detailed analysis of drilling data and of surface and downhole geophysics indicates that at least some of the known geothermal occurrences (Cerro Prieto, Brawley and the Salton Sea) are underlain by pull-apart basins apparently caused by crustal spreading above a local section of

the East Pacific Rise crest (24). Very young volcanic activity has occurred at Cerro Prieto where a rhyolitic volcanic cone is known, and along the southern margin of the Salton Sea where rhyolite domes occur. The Salton Sea domes are approximately 60,000 years old (25).

The Cerro Prieto hydrothermal field provides an example of a Salton Trough resource type. This field is water-dominated producing from depths of 1.5 to over 3 km. Fluid temperatures range from about 200 deg C to over 350 deg C (26). The rocks are composed of an upper layer of unconsolidated silts, sands and clays, and a layer of consolidated sandstones and shales overlying the crystalline basement (27). Two principal reservoir horizons occur in sandstones within the consolidated sequence. Enhanced production has been noted in the vicinity of faults, indicating that fracture permeability is important, although intergranular permeability due to dissolution of minerals by the geothermal fluids is believed to be important also (28). Reservoir recharge is apparently from the northeast and east and consists partly of Colorado River water (29). A conceptual model of fluid flow at Cerro Prieto (Figure 16) has been developed by Halfman et al. (30). They conclude that water flows upward from depth within permeable sandstone units that have a shallow dip. The permeable units are overlain by impermeable shales, and the water gains access to permeable units higher in the section through breaks in the shales.

The geothermal fluid from Cerro Prieto, after steam separation, contains about 25,000 ppm total dissolved solids. This figure is much lower than some of the other resources in the Salton Trough. For example, the Salton Sea hydrothermal field contains 20 to 30 percent by weight by solids.

The Geysers, CA

The Geysers geothermal area is the world's largest producer of electricity from geothermal fluids with about 1,800 MWe from 22 plants on line and an additional 800 MWe scheduled. This area lies about 150 km north of San Francisco. The portion of the resource being exploited is a vapor-dominated field having a temperature of 240 deg C. The ultimate potential of the vapor-dominated system is not known. Associated with the vapor-dominated field are believed to be several unexploited hot water-dominated reservoirs whose volumes and temperatures are unassessed (Figure 17).

The geology of The Geysers area is complex, especially structurally. Reservoir rocks consist mainly of fractured greywackes, which are sandstone-like rocks consisting of poorly sorted fragments of quartzite, shale, granite, volcanic rocks and other rocks. Fracturing has created the reservoir permeability. Overlying the reservoir rocks is a series of impermeable metamorphosed rocks (serpentinite, gneiss, melange and metagranite) that forms a cap on the system.

The presently known steam field is confined between the Mercuryville fault zone on the southwest and the Collayomi fault zone on the northeast (Figure 18). The northwest and southeast margins of the steam field are not definitely known. Surface manifestations of the steam field include two small areas, the largest one being known as The Big Geysers, an area of hot springs, fumaroles and hydrothermal alteration. The extent of surface manifestations is curiously small compared to the large size of the underlying steam resource.

To the east and northeast lies the extensive Clear Lake volcanic field composed of dacite, rhyolite, andesite and basalt. The interval of eruption for these volcanics extends from 2 million to 10,000 years ago, with ages progressively younger northward (31). The Clear Lake volcanics are very porous and soak up large quantities of surface water. It is believed that recharge of a deep, briny hot-water reservoir comes from water percolating through the Clear Lake volcanics, and that this deep reservoir supplies steam to the vapor-dominated system through boiling (Figure 17), although the deep water table has never been intersected by drilling. Geophysical surveys indicate the presence of a large magma chamber underlying the Clear Lake volcanic rocks and centered on Mt. Hanna, immediately northeast of the Collayomi fault zone (32).

Basin and Range

The Basin and Range province extends northward from Mexico into southern Arizona, southwestern New Mexico and Texas on the south, through parts of California, Nevada and Utah, and becomes ill-defined beneath the covering volcanic flows of the Columbia Plateau and the Snake River plain on the north (Figure 14). The northern portion of this area contains abundant geothermal resources of all temperatures. Resources along the eastern and western margins of the province appear to be both more abundant and of higher temperature.

Electrical power is presently being generated from Roosevelt Hot Springs (20 MWe) and Cove Fort/Sulphurdale (3.2 MWe) in Utah; from Beowawe (17 MWe), Desert Peak (9 MWe), Wabuska (0.6 MWe), and Steamboat Springs (5.4 MWe) in Nevada; and from Coso Hot Springs (30 MWe) in California. Exploration is being or has been conducted at probably 20 or more sites. Direct application of geothermal energy for industrial process heating and space heating are currently operating in this area at several sites including Brady Hot Springs (vegetable drying), Reno (space heating) and Salt Lake City (greenhouse heating).

The reasons for the abundance of resources in the Basin and Range seem clear. This area, especially at its margins, is an active area geologically. Volcanism only a few hundred years old

is known from tens of areas. The area is also active seismically and faulting that causes the uplift of mountain ranges also serves to keep pathways open for deep fluid circulation.

As an example of a Basin and Range hydrothermal system, we will discuss Roosevelt Hot Springs, although it should not be supposed to be typical of all high-temperature occurrences in this province. The oldest rocks exposed (Figures 19 and 20) are Precambrian sedimentary rocks that have been extensively metamorphosed. These rocks were intruded during Miocene time by granitic rocks (33) and (34). Rhyolite volcanic flows and domes were emplaced during the interval 800,000 to 500,000 years ago. The area has been complexly faulted by north- to northwest-trending high-angle faults and by east-west high-angle faults. The Negro Mag fault is such an east-west fault that is an important controlling structure in the north portion of the field. The north-trending Opal Mound fault apparently forms the western limit of the system. The oldest fault system is a series of low-angle denudation faults (Figure 20) along which the upper plate has moved west by about 600 m and has broken into a series of discrete blocks. Producing areas in the southern portion of the field are located in zones of intersection of the upper-plate faults with the Opal Mound and other parallel faults. Producing zones in the northern part of the region are located at the intersection of north-south and east-west faults. The permeability is obviously fracture controlled.

Cascade Range and Vicinity

The Cascade Range of northern California, Oregon, Washington and British Columbia is comprised of a series of volcanos, 12 of which have been active in historic times. The May 18, 1980 eruption of Mount St. Helens attests to be the youth of volcanic activity here. The Cascade Range lies above the zone of subduction of the Juan de Fuca plate beneath the North American plate, (Figure 2) and magma moving into the upper crust has transported large amounts of heat upward. In spite of the widespread, young volcanism, however, geothermal manifestations are not as plentiful as expected. High rainfall and snowfall in the Cascades are believed to suppress surface geothermal manifestations through downward percolation of the cold surface waters in the highly permeable volcanic rocks. In the absence of surface manifestation, discovery becomes much more difficult.

No producible high-temperature hydrothermal systems have yet been located in the Cascades. A vapor-dominated system is present at Lassen Peak in California, but it lies within a national park, and will not be developed. A hydrothermal system having temperatures greater than 200 deg C has been located at Newberry Caldera in Oregon through research drilling sponsored by the U. S. Geological Survey (35), but the known portion of the

system lies within the caldera will not be exploited for environmental reasons.

Industry's exploration efforts have increased somewhat in the last several years. The Department of Energy is currently sponsoring a cost-shared drilling program with industry to encourage more subsurface exploration and to help develop research data for devising new exploration techniques. To date, two holes have been drilled at Newberry volcano by GEO Operator Corporation, and one hole has been completed by Thermal Power Company north of Mt. Jefferson. A third research hole has been started on the southeast slope of Mt. Mazama, the volcano whose summit consists of the Crater Lake caldera. This hole has found interesting temperatures at shallow depths (+100 deg C at 1300 feet), but the hole remains unfinished at this writing.

The use of geothermal energy for space heating at Klamath Falls, Oregon is well known (36), and numerous hot springs and wells occur throughout the Cascades. Potential for discovery of resources in all temperature categories is great (37).

Snake River Plain

The basalt flows and other volcanic deposits of the Snake River Plain are an extension of the Columbia Plateau eastward across southern Idaho to the border with Wyoming. The Plain is divided into a western part and an eastern part. Thermal waters occur in numerous wells and springs in the western portion, especially on or near the edges of the plain. Geochemically indicated resource temperatures exceed 150 deg C at Neal Hot Springs and Vale, Oregon and Crane Creek, Idaho, but indicated temperatures for most resources are lower. Younger volcanic rocks occur in the eastern part of the plain, but no high-temperature resources are yet identified. This part of the plain is underlain by a high-flow, cold-water aquifer that is believed to mask surface geothermal indications.

The ages of volcanic eruptions decrease from west to east along the Snake River Plain, apparently reflecting the arcuate track of a mantle plume as the North American plate moved westward. Recent volcanic activity has taken place at Yellowstone, under which the hot spot currently lies. Future violent eruptions in the area are possible. The vapor- and water-dominated hydrothermal systems at Yellowstone will not be developed because they lie within a national park, but surrounding areas are highly prospective.

Direct use of hydrothermal energy for space heating is famous at Boise, Idaho, where the Warm Springs district has been heating homes geothermally for almost 100 years (38). Also, near this area, but lying in the Basin and Range, is the Raft River site where the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory of DOE constructed and operated a 5 MWe binary demonstration plant on a hydrothermal resource whose temperature is 147 deg C. This

project is currently inoperative and the plant has been sold.

Rio Grande Rift

The Rio Grande Rift is a north-trending tectonic feature that extends from Mexico through central New Mexico and ends in central Colorado. It is a down-dropped area that has been filled with volcanic rocks and erosional debris from the bordering plateaus and mountains. The rift began to form in late Oligocene times, and volcanic and seismic activity have occurred subsequently to the present.

There are several low- and intermediate-temperature hydrothermal convection systems in this area, but the only high-temperature system that has been drill tested to any significant extent and where production is proven is a hot water-dominated system in the Valles caldera (39) and (40). Deep drilling has encountered a hydrothermal convection system in fractured Tertiary volcanic, Paleozoic sedimentary and Precambrian granitic rocks at an average depth of 2 to 3 km. Temperatures as high as 300 deg C have been recorded. An attempt by DOE, Union Geothermal and Public Service Company of New Mexico to build a demonstration plant at that location failed when the steam supply proved to be inadequate. Recent research drilling, sponsored by DOE under the Continental Scientific Drilling Program, has developed an improved understanding of the area. Geologists believe that the area contains an important, undiscovered hydrothermal resource capable of electrical power generation. Also located near the caldera is the site of Los Alamos National Laboratory's hot dry rock experiment at Fenton Hill.

Madison and other Aquifers

Underlying a large area in western North and South Dakota, eastern Montana and northeastern Wyoming are a number of aquifers that contain thermal waters. These aquifers have developed in carbonates and sandstones of Paleozoic and Mesozoic age. The permeability is both intergranular and fracture controlled in the case of the sandstones (e.g. the Dakota Sandstone) and fracture and solution cavities in the carbonates (e.g. the Madison Limestone). Some of the aquifers produce under artesian pressure. Depths to production vary widely but average perhaps 2,000 ft. Temperatures are 30 to 80 deg C (41) in the Madison but are lower in other shallower aquifers such as the Dakota. Direct use of the thermal water is being made at a few locations today (42), and it is evident that the potential for further development is substantial.

Balcones Zone, TX

Thermal waters at temperatures generally below 60 deg C

occur in a zone that trends northeasterly across central Texas. Many of the large population centers are in or near this zone, and there appears to be significant potential for geothermal development in spite of the rather low temperatures.

An initial assessment of the geothermal potential has been documented by Woodruff and McBride (43). The thermal waters occur in a band broadly delimited by the Balcones fault zone on the west and the Luling-Mexia-Talco fault zone on the east. In many locations the thermal waters are low enough in content of dissolved salts to be potable, and indeed many communities already tap the warm waters for their municipal water supplies.

The geothermal aquifers are mostly Cretaceous Sandstone units, although locally thermal waters are provided from Cretaceous limestones and Tertiary sandstones. The thermally anomalous zone coincides with an ancient zone of structural weakness dating back more than 200 million years. The zone has been a hinge line with uplift of mountain ranges to the north and west and downwarping to the south and east. Sediments have deposited in the area of downwarping, and the rate of sedimentation has kept pace with sinking, keeping this area close to sea level. Structural deformation of the sediments, including faulting and folding, and interfingering of diverse sedimentary units have resulted in the complex aquifer system of today. The source of the anomalous heat is not known with certainty.

Hawaiian Islands

The chain of islands known as the Hawaiian archipelago stretches 2,500 km in a northwest-southeast line across the Pacific Ocean from Kure and Midway Islands to the Big Island of Hawaii. Built of basaltic volcanic rocks, this island chain boasts the greatest volcanic masses on earth. The volcano Kilauea rises 9,800 m above the floor of the ocean, the world's largest mountain in terms of elevation above its base. The Kilauea, Mauna Loa and other vents on the big island are in an almost continual state of eruptive activity, but by contrast volcanos on the other islands have shown little recent activity. Haleakala on the island of Maui is the only other volcano in the state that has erupted in the last few hundred years, and the last eruption there was in 1790 (44).

Several of the Hawaiian islands are believed to have geothermal potential. The only area where exploration has proceeded far enough to establish the existence of a hydrothermal reservoir is in the Puna district on the Big Island near Kapoho along the so-called "East Rift", a fault zone on the east flank of Kilauea. Here a well was completed to a depth of 1965 m (45) with a bottom-hole temperature of 358 deg C. A 3 MWe generator is currently being operated at the site. Exploration is underway by several companies in areas adjacent to the operating plant. Elsewhere on the islands, potential for occurrence of low- to

moderate- temperature resources has been established at a number of locations on Hawaii, Maui and Oahu, although little drilling to prove resources has been completed (46).

Alaska

Little geothermal exploration work has been done in Alaska. A number of geothermal occurrences are located on the Alaska Peninsula and the Aleutian Islands and in central and southeast Alaska. The Aleutians and the Peninsula overlie a zone of active subduction (Figure 2), and volcanos are numerous. A hydrothermal system was located at Makushin volcano on the island of Unalaska (47) and the island of Adak is also believed to have good discovery potential.

Low- and moderate-temperature resources are indicated in a number of locations in Alaska by occurrence of hot springs (22). One area that has been studied in more detail and has had limited drilling is Pilgrim Hot Springs (48). This site is 75 km north of Nome, Alaska. Initial drilling has confirmed the presence of a hot water reservoir about 1 sq km in extent that has artesian flow rates of 200-400 gallons per minute of 90 deg C water.

gradient are merely average, as previously discussed.

Sedimentary Basins and Regional Aquifers

Some basins are filled to depths of 10 km or more with sedimentary rocks that have intergranular permeability. Such basins often contain accumulations of oil and gas. In some of the sedimentary units, circulation of ground water can be very deep. Vertical permeability is usually provided by faults. Water in deep rock units may be heated in a normal or enhanced geothermal gradient and may then either return to the near-surface environment or remain trapped at depth. Basin fluids range in chemical composition from relatively fresh water to highly saline. It is believed that many basin fluids were originally connate waters (trapped in the rocks at the time of formation) of seawater composition (15). Chemical interaction of these waters with rocks in the basin along their flowpaths leads to changes in the chemistry of the brine. Basins often contain evaporite beds of salts that dissolve easily in the basin fluids, bringing them to high salinities. An understanding of the chemistry of basin waters can sometimes lead to the identification of areas of upwelling fluids which may be thermally anomalous. Most basin waters are too low in temperature for the generation of electricity but may be used for direct applications such as space heating and greenhouseing.

The Madison carbonate rock sequence of widespread occurrence in North and South Dakota, Wyoming, Montana, and northward into Canada contains warm waters that are currently being tapped by drill holes for space heating and agricultural purposes. In a similar application, space-heating systems installed in France use warm water contained in the Paris basin (16). Many other occurrences of this resource type are known worldwide.

Geopressured Resources

Geopressured resources also occur in basin environments. They consist of deeply buried fluids contained in permeable sedimentary rocks warmed in a normal or anomalous geothermal gradient by their great burial depth. The fluids are tightly confined by surrounding impermeable rock and bear pressure much greater than hydrostatic, that is, the fluid pressure supports a portion of the weight of the overlying rock column as well as the weight of the water column (Figure 9). A large amount of geopressured fluids is found in the Gulf Coast of the U.S. (Figure 12), where it generally contains dissolved methane. Therefore, three sources of energy are actually available from these resources: 1) heat, 2) mechanical energy due to the great pressure with which these waters exit the borehole, and 3) recoverable methane.

The U.S. Department of Energy, is currently sponsoring

research to develop a better understanding of geopressured resources and exploitation technologies. Activities include the testing of geopressured wells to determine the nature and extent of the resource, its production characteristics and the potential environmental effects of long-term production. The research also includes the design and analysis of a total energy recovery system. These resources will probably contribute during the mid to late 1990s or the next century.

Radiogenic Resources

Research has been done that could lead to development of radiogenic geothermal resources in the eastern U.S. (17). The coastal plain of the East is blanketed by a layer of thermally insulating sediments. In places beneath these sediments, rocks occur that have an anomalously high rate of heat production due to decay of natural radioactive isotopes of uranium, thorium and potassium. These radioactive rocks represent old granitic intrusions, long since cooled. Methods for locating radiogenic rocks beneath sedimentary cover have been partly developed, and very limited drill testing of the geothermal target concept (Figure 10) has been completed under DOE funding, although no such research is being conducted by the federal government today.

Hot Dry Rock Resources

Hot dry rock resources are defined as heat stored in rocks within about 10 km of the surface from which the energy cannot be economically extracted by natural hot water or steam. These hot rocks have few pore spaces or fractures, and therefore contain little water and little or no interconnected permeability. The feasibility and economics of extraction of heat from hot dry rock has, for the past decade, been the subject of a \$150 million research program at the Department of Energy's Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico (18). Batchelor (19) describes similar research in England. Both projects indicate that it is technologically feasible to induce an artificial fracture system in hot, tight rocks at depths of about 3 km through hydraulic fracturing from a deep well. During formation of the fracture system, its dimensions, location and orientation are mapped using geophysical techniques. A second borehole is located and drilled such that it intersects the hydraulic fracture system. Water can then be circulated down one hole, through the fracture system where it removes heat from the rocks, and up the second hole (Figure 11).

The principal aim of the research at Los Alamos is to develop the engineering data needed for industry to evaluate the economic viability of candidate resources. The current plans are for a one-year flow test of the existing two-well system in order to determine production characteristics of the artificially

POTENTIAL FOR GEOTHERMAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE U.S.

Muffler et al. (22) have dealt with the problem of how much accessible resource exists in the U. S. both at known sites and those that are undiscovered. They conclude that the undiscovered resource base is on the order of 3 to 5 times greater than the resources known today. These figures do not include possible hot dry rock or other more speculative resources. Table 4 is a summary of the current estimate of the geothermal resource base as taken from Muffler et al. (22). This table demonstrates our lack of resource knowledge through the ranges and relative amounts of undiscovered resources and through the many missing numbers. We can conclude, however, that the geothermal resource base is large in the U. S.

REFERENCES

- Batchelor, A. S., 1982, The stimulation of a hot dry rock geothermal reservoir in the Cornubian Granite, England: *i_n_* Proc. Eighth Workshop Geoth. Reservoir Eng., Stanford University, Stanford, California, SGP-TR-60, p. 237-248.
- Bjornsson, S., 1980, Natural heat saves millions of barrels of oil: *Atlantica and Iceland Review*, v. 18, p. 28-37.
- Bott, M. H. P., 1982, *The Interior of the Earth: its structure, constitution and evolution*: Edward Arnold (Publishers), Ltd., London.
- Carson, C. C., and Allen, A. D., 1984, A program to investigate the engineering feasibility of extracting energy from shallow magma bodies: *Geothermal Resources Council, Trans.*, v. 8, p. 3-5.
- Costain, J. K., Glover, L. III, and Sinha, A. K., 1980, Low temperature geothermal resources in the Eastern United States: *EOS*, v. 61, p. 1-13.
- Henley, R. W., and Ellis, A. J., 1983, Geothermal systems ancient and modern, a geochemical review: *Earth Science Review*, v. 19, p. 1-50.
- Hitchon, , 1971
- Mahon, W. A. J., Klyen, L. E., and Rhode, M., 1980, Neutral sodium/bicarbonate/sulfate hot waters in geothermal systems: *Chinetsu (J. of the Japan Geothermal Energy Assn.)*, v. 17, p. 11-24.
- Norton, D. L., 1984, Theory of hydrothermal systems: *Ann. Rev. Earth Planet, Sci.*, v. 12, p. 155-177.
- Smith, M. C., and Ponder, G. M., 1982, Hot dry rock geothermal energy development program annual report fiscal year 1981: Los Alamos Nat. Lab., NM, (LA-9287-HDR).
- Varet, J., 1982, *Usage direct de la chaleur*, ed. *Geothermie basse-energie*: Masson, Paris.
- Williams, D. L., and Von Herzen, R. P., 1974, Heat loss from the earth: new estimate: *Geology*, v. 2, p. 327-328.
- White, D. E., 1965, Geothermal energy: *U.S. Geol. Surv. Circ.* 519.
- White, D. E., and Williams, D. L., Eds., 1975, *Assessment of Geothermal Resources of the United States-1975*: *Geol. Surv. Circ* 726.

White, D. E., Muffler, L. J. P., and Truesdell, A. H., 1971, Vapor-dominated hydrothermal systems compared with hot-water systems: Ecol. Geology, v. 66, p. 75-97.

Aldrich, M. J. (1986) Tectonics of the Jemez lineament in the Jemez Mountains and Rio Grande Rift, Journal of Geophysical Research, 91, 1753-1762.

Allison, M. L. and D. L. Nielson (1987) Survey of borehole breakouts from active geothermal systems, EOS, 68, p. 1460-1461.

Bacon, C. R., 1983, Eruption history of Mount Mazama and Crater Lake Caldera, Cascade Range, U.S.A.: Jour. Volcano and Geothermal Research, v. 18, p. 57-115.

Bacon, C. R., Duffield, W. A. and Nakamura, K., Distribution of Quaternary rhyolite domes of the Coso Range, California: implications for extent of the geothermal anomaly, Journal of Geophysical Research, 85, 2425-2433, 1980.

Behrman, P. G. and R. B. Knapp (1980) Structure of the Redondo Creek area, Baca project: implications concerning the nature of permeability and control on production, Union Oil Co. internal report, University of Utah Research Institute Open File Report, 43 p.

Blackwell, D. D. and Steele, J. L., Geothermal data from deep holes in the Oregon Cascade range, Geothermal Resources Council Transactions, 11, 317-322, 1987.

Cummings, D., Mechanical analysis of the effect of the Timber Mountain caldera on basin and range faults, Journal of Geophysical Research, 73, 2787-2794, 1968.

Doell, R. R., G. B. Dalrymple, R. L. Smith, and R. A. Bailey (1968) Paleomagnetism, potassium-argon ages, and geology of rhyolite and associated rocks of the Valles caldera, New Mexico, Geological Society of America Memoir 116, 211-248.

Evans, S. H. and D. L. Nielson (1982) Thermal and tectonic history of the Mineral Mountains intrusive complex, Geothermal Resources Council Transactions, 6, p. 15-18.

Gardner, J. N., F. Goff, S. Garcia, and R. C. Hagen (1986) Stratigraphic relations and lithologic variations in the Jemez volcanic field, New Mexico, Journal of Geophysical Research, 91, 1763-1778.

Goff, F., J. N. Gardner, R. Vidale, and R. Charles (1985) Geochemistry and isotopes of fluids from Sulphur Springs, Valles caldera, New Mexico, Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research, 23, 2734-2797.

Goff, F. and Shevenell, L., Travertine deposits of Soda Dam, New Mexico, and their implications for the age and evolution of the Valles caldera hydrothermal system, Geological Society of America Bull., 99, 292-302, 1987.

Griscom, A. and Roberts, C. W., 1983, Gravity and magnetic interpretation of Newberry Volcano, Oregon; in Priest, G. R., Vogt, B. F., and Black, G. L. (eds.) Survey of Potential

- Geothermal sites at Newberry volcano, Deschutes County, Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries, Open File Report 0-83-3, p. 68-81.
- Harrison, T. M., P. Morgan and D. D. Blackwell (1986) Constraints on heating at the Fenton Hill site, Valles caldera, New Mexico, Journal of Geophysical Research, 91, 1899-1908.
- Heiken, G., F. Goff, J. Stix, S. Tamanyu, M. Shafiqullah, S. Garcia, and R. Hagan (1986) Intracaldera volcanic activity, Toledo caldera and embayment, Jemez Mountains, New Mexico, Journal of Geophysical Research, 91, 1799-1815.
- Higgins, M. W. and Waters, A. C., 1970, A reevaluation of basalt-obsidian relations at East Lake fissure, Newberry Caldera, Oregon: Geological Society of Amer. Bul., v. 81, p. 1835-2842.
- Hildreth, W., Gradients in silicic magma chambers: implications for lithospheric magmatism, Journal of Geophysical Research, 86, 10153-10192, 1981.
- Hulen, J. B., D. L. Nielson, F. Goff, J. N. Gardner and R. W. Charles (1987) Molybdenum mineralization in an active geothermal system, Valles caldera, New Mexico, Geology, 15, 748-752.
- Hulen, J. B. and Nielson, D. L., Hydrothermal alteration in the Baca geothermal system, Redondo dome, Valles caldera, New Mexico, Journal of Geophysical Research, 91, 1867-1886, 1986.
- Hulen, J. B. and D. L. Nielson (1988) Hydrothermal brecciation in the Jemez fault zone, Valles caldera, New Mexico--Results from CSDP corehole VC-1, Journal of Geophysical Research, 93.
- Hulen, J. B. and B. S. Sibbett (1982) Sampling and interpretation of drill cuttings from geothermal wells, Society of Professional Well Log Analysts, reprint volume, Tulsa, p. IV3-IV54.
- Keith, T. E. C., White, D. E. and Beeson, M. H., Hydrothermal alteration and self-sealing in Y-7 and Y-8 drill holes in northern part of Upper Geyser Basin, Yellowstone National Park, Wyoming, U. S. Geological Survey Prof. Paper 1054-A, 26 p., 1978.
- Lachenbruch, A. H., Sass, J. H., Munroe, R. J., and Moses, T. H., Geothermal setting and simple heat conduction models for the Long Valley caldera: Journal of Geophysical Research, 81, 769-784, 1976.
- Laidley, R. A., and McKay, D. S., 1971, Geochemical examination of obsidians from Newberry Caldera, Oregon: Contr. Mineral. and Petrol., v. 30, p. 336-342.
- Lipman, P. W., P. D. Rowley, H. H. Mehnert, S. H. Evans, W. P. Nash, F. H. Brown (1978) Pleistocene rhyolite of the Mineral Range, Utah: Geothermal and archeological significance, U. S. Geological Survey Jour. of Research, 6, 133-147.
- MacLeod, N. S. and Sammel, E. A., 1982, Newberry volcano, Oregon: A Cascade range geothermal prospect: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries, Oregon Geology, v. 44, p. 123-131.

- MacLeod, N. S., Sherrod, D. R., Chitwood, L. A., and McKee, E. H., 1981, Newberry volcano, Oregon, in Johnston, D. A., and Donnelly-Nolan, J., eds., Guides to some volcanic terranes in Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and northern California: U. S. Geological Survey Circular 838, p. 85-103.
- Moore, J. N. and S. M. Samberg (1979) Geology of the Cove Fort-Sulphurdale KGRA, University of Utah Research Institute Earth Science Lab. Rept. 18, Salt Lake City.
- Muller, O. H. and Pollard, D. D. (1977) The state of stress near Spanish Peaks, Colorado determined from a dike pattern, Pure Applied Geophysics, 115, 69-86.
- Nakamura, K., Volcanoes as possible indicators of tectonic stress orientation-principal and proposal, Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research, 2, 1-16, 1977.
- Nielson, D. L., Evans, S. H., and Sibbett, B. S., Magmatic, structural, and hydrothermal evolution of the Mineral Mountains intrusive complex, Utah, Geological Society of America, 97, 765-777, 1986.
- Nielson, D. L. and Hulen, J. B., Internal geology and evolution of the Redondo dome, Valles caldera, New Mexico, Journal of Geophysical Research, 89, 8695-8711, 1984.
- Nielson, D. L., B. S. Sibbett, D. B. McKinney, J. B. Hulen, J. N. Moore, and S. M. Samberg (1978) Geology of Roosevelt Hot Springs KGRA, Beaver County, Utah, University of Utah Research Institute Earth Science Lab Rept. 12, Salt Lake City, 12lp.
- Ode, H., Mechanical analysis of the dike pattern of the Spanish Peaks area, Colorado, Geological Society of America Bull., 68, 567-576, 1957.
- Priest, G. R., 1983, Geology of the Newberry volcano area, Deschutes County, Oregon, in Priest, G. R., Vogt, B. F., and Black, G. L. (eds.) Survey of potential geothermal sites at Newberry volcano, Deschutes County, Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries Open File Report 0-83-3, p. 5-20.
- Ryan, M. P., The mechanics and three-dimensional internal structure of active magmatic systems: Kilauea volcano, Hawaii, Journal of Geophysical Research, 93, 4213-4248, 1988.
- Sammel, E. A., Results of test drilling at Newberry Volcano, Oregon, Geothermal Resources Council Bulletin, 3-8, December, 1981.
- Self, S., F. Goff, J. N. Gardner, J. V. Wright, W. M. Kite (1986) Explosive rhyolitic volcanism in the Jemez Mountains: vent locations, caldera development and relation to regional structure, Journal of Geophysical Research, 91, 1779-1798.
- Sibbett, B. S. (1983) Structural control and alteration at Beowawe KGRA, Nevada, Geothermal Resources Council Transactions, 7, p. 187-191.
- Sibbett, B. S. and D. L. Nielson (1980) Geology of central Mineral Mountains, Beaver County, Utah, University of Utah Research Institute Earth Science Lab. Rept. 33, Salt Lake City, 42p.

- Smith, R. L. and Bailey, R. A., Resurgent cauldrons, in Coats, R. R., Hay, R. L., and Anderson, C. A., Studies in Volcanology, Geological Society of America Memoir 116, 613-662, 1968.
- Smith, R. L., R. A. Bailey and C. S. Ross (1970) Geologic map of the Jemez Mountains, New Mexico, U. S. Geological Survey Misc. Investigations Map I-571.
- Smith, R. L. and Shaw, H. R., Igneous-related geothermal systems, in White, D. E. and Williams, D. L. (eds.) Assessment of Geothermal Resources of the United States-1975, U. S. Geol. Survey Circ. 726, p. 58-83, 1975.
- Sorey, M. L. and Ingebritson, S. E., Quantitative analysis of the hydrothermal system in Lassen Volcanic National Park and Lassen Known Geothermal Resource Area, U. S. Geological Survey Water Resources Investigations Report 84-4278, 79 p., 1984.
- Sorey, M. L., Lewis, R. E. and Olmsted, F. H., The hydrothermal system of Long Valley caldera, California, U. S. Geological Survey Prof. Paper 1044-A, 60p., 1978.
- Steven, T. A. and Eaton, G. P., Environment of ore deposition in the Creede mining district, San Juan Mountains, Colorado: I. Geologic, hydrologic, and geophysical setting, Economic Geology, 70, 1023-1037, 1975.
- United States Geological Survey, Geologic map of Yellowstone National Park, U. S. Geological Survey Misc. Geological Investigations Map I-711, 1972.
- Walker, G. W., and Nolf, B., 1981, High Lava Plain, Brothers fault zone Harney Basin, Oregon: in Johnston, D. A. and Donnelly-Nolan, J., eds., Guide to some volcanic terranes in Washington, Idaho, Oregon and northern California: U. S. Geol. Survey Cir. 838, 105-111.

REFERENCES

- Adams, M. C., and J. M. Moore, (1987): Hydrothermal alteration and fluid geochemistry of the Meager Mountain geothermal system; American Journal of Science, v. 267, p. 720-755.
- Adams, M. C., M. Lemieux, J. N. Moore and S. D. Johnson (1988) Fluid chemistry and hydrology of the Heber geothermal system, California, Transactions Geothermal Resources Council, in press.
- Aumento, F., P. Viale, M. Choussy, and A. Santana (1982) Alteration mineralogy of the Ahuachapan geothermal field, Transactions, Geothermal Resources Council, v. 6, p. 7-10.
- Ballantyne J. M. and J. N. Moore (1988) A new illite geothermometer, Proceedings of the Thirteenth Workshop on Geothermal Reservoir Engineering, Stanford University, California, in press.
- Bird, D. K., P. Schiffman, W. A. Elders, A. E. Williams, and S. D. McDowell, (1984) Calc-silicate mineralization in active geothermal systems, Economic Geology, v. 79, p. 671-695.

- Browne, P. R. L. (1977) Occurrence and hydrothermal alteration of diabase, Heber geothermal field, Imperial Valley, California, Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Physics, University of California, Riverside, UCR/IGPP-77/9.
- Browne, P. R. L. (1978) Hydrothermal alteration in active geothermal fields, Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences, v. 6, p. 229-250.
- Browne, P. R. L., and A. J. Ellis, (1970) The Ohaki-Broadlands hydrothermal area, New Zealand: mineralogy and related geochemistry, American Journal of Science, v. 269, p. 97-131.
- Capuano, R. M. and J. N. Moore (1980) Hg and As soil geochemistry as a technique for mapping permeable structures over a hot-water geothermal system; Abstracts with Programs, Rocky Mountain Section of the Geological Society of America, V. 12, p. 269.
- Cathelineau, M., R. Oliver, D. Nieva and A. Garfias (1985) Mineralogy and distribution of hydrothermal mineral zones in Los Azufres (Mexico) geothermal field, Geothermics, v. 14, p. 49-57.
- Christensen, O. D., R. M. Capuano, and J. N. Moore (1983) Trace element distribution in an active hydrothermal system, Roosevelt Hot Springs thermal area, Utah, Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research, v. 16, p. 99-129.
- Coplan, T. B., P. Kolesar, R. E. Taylor, C. Kendall and C. Mooser (1975) Investigations of the Dunes geothermal anomaly, Imperial Valley, California: Part IV. Geochemical studies of water, calcite, and silicates, Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Physics, University of California, Riverside, UCR/IGPP-75/20.
- Craig, H., 1963, The isotopic geochemistry of water and carbon in geothermal areas, in Nuclear geology on geothermal areas, Spoleto: Pisa, Consiglio Nazionale delle Recerche, Laboratorie de Geologia Nucleare.
- de Boer J. (1979) Paleomagnetism of the Quaternary Cerro Prieto, Crater Elegante, and Salton Buttes volcanic domes in the northern part of the Gulf of California rhombochasm, in Proceedings, Second Symposium on the Cerro Prieto geothermal field, Mexicali Mexico, Comision Federal de Electricidad, p. 91-98.
- Dibblee, T. W. Jr. (1954) Geology of the Imperial Valley region, California, in Geology of southern California, R. H. Jahns, ed., California Division of Mines and Geology Bulletin, v.170, p. 21-28.
- DiPippo, R. (1988) International developments in geothermal power production, Geothermal Resources Council Bulletin, v. 17, p. 8-19.
- Elders, W. A. (1977) Petrology as a practical tool in geothermal studies, Transactions, Geothermal Resources Council v. 1, p. 143-145.
- Elders, W. A. (1979) The geological background of the geothermal fields of the Salton Trough, in Geology and Geothermics of the Salton Trough, W. A. Elders, ed., Campus Museum

- Contribution No. 5, University of California, Riverside, p. 1-19.
- Elders, W. A. and L. H. Cohen (1983) The Salton Sea geothermal field, California, as a near-field natural analog of a radioactive waste repository in salt, report to Columbus, Battelle Memorial Institute, Office of Nuclear Waste Isolation, BMI/ONWI-513.
- Elders, W. A., R. Rex, T. Meidav, P. T. Robinson and S. Biehler (1972) Crustal spreading in southern California, *Science*, v. 178, p. 15-24.
- Ellis, A. J. and W. A. J. Mahon (1977) *Chemistry and geothermal systems*, Academic Press, Inc.
- Fournier, R. O. (1977) Chemical geothermometers and mixing models for geothermal systems, in *Proceedings of the International Atomic Energy Agency Advisory Group on the Application of Nuclear Techniques to Geothermal Studies*, Pisa, 1975, *Geothermics*, Special Issue 5, p. 41-50.
- Fournier, R. O. (1979) Geochemical and hydrologic considerations and the use of enthalpy-chloride diagrams in the prediction of underground conditions in hot-spring systems, *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research*, v. 5, p. 1-16.
- Fournier, R. O. (1981) Application of water geochemistry to geothermal exploration and reservoir engineering in *Geothermal Systems: Principles and Case Histories*, L. Ryback and L. P. J. Muffler, eds. John Wiley and Sons, New York, p. 109-143.
- Fournier, R. O. and J. J. Rowe (1966) Estimation of underground temperatures from the silica content of water from hot springs and wet-steam wells, *American Journal of Science*, v. 264, p. 685-697.
- Fournier R. O. and R. W. Potter II (1979) Magnesium correction to the Na-K-Ca chemical geothermometer, *Geochemica Cosmochemica Acta*, v. 43, p. 1543-1550.
- Fournier R. O. and A. H. Truesdell, (1973) An empirical Na-K-Ca geothermometer for natural waters, *Geochemica Cosmochemica Acta*, v. 37, p. 1255-1275.
- Fournier R. O. and A. H. Truesdell (1974) Geochemical indicators of subsurface temperature, 2. Estimation of temperature and fraction of hot water mixed with cold water, U. S. Geological Survey *Journal of Research*, v. 2, p. 263-270.
- Fuis, G. S., W. D. Mooney, J. H. Healy, G. A. McMechan and W. J. Lutter (1984) A seismic refraction survey of the Imperial Valley region, California, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, v. 89(B2), p. 1165-1189.
- Goldstein, N. E., M. J. Wilt and D. J. Corrigan (1984) Analysis of the Nuevo Leon magnetic anomaly and its possible relation to the Cerro Prieto magmatic-hydrothermal system, *Geothermics*, v. 13, p. 3-11.
- Griscom, A. and L. J. P. Muffler (1971) Aeromagnetic map and interpretation of the Salton Sea geothermal area, California, U. S. Geological Survey *Geophysical Investigations Map GP 754*.
- Halfman, S. E., M. J. Lippmann, R. Zelwer and J. H. Howard (1984) *Geologic interpretation of geothermal fluid movement in*

- Cerro Prieto field, Baja California, Mexico, American Association of Petroleum Geologists Bulletin, v. 68, p. 18-30.
- Hedenquist J. W. and R. W. Henley (1985) Effect of CO₂ on freezing point depression measurements of fluid inclusions - evidence from active systems and implications for epithermal mineralization, Economic Geology, v. 80, p. 1379-1406.
- Helgeson, H. A. (1968) Geologic and thermodynamic characteristics of the Salton Sea geothermal system: American Journal of Science, v. 266, p. 129-166.
- Henley, R. W., and Ellis, A. J. 1983: Geothermal systems, ancient and modern; Earth Science Reviews, v. 19, p. 1-50.
- Henley, R. W., A. H. Truesdell and P. B. Barton Jr. (1984) Fluid-mineral equilibria in hydrothermal systems, Reviews in Economic Geology, v. 1.
- Hinkle, M. E. (1980) Survey of helium in soils and soil gases and mercury in soils at Roosevelt Hot Springs known geothermal resource area, Utah, United States Geological Survey Open-File Report 80-613, 53 p.
- Hulen, J. B. and D. L. Nielson, (1986) Hydrothermal alteration in the Baca geothermal system, Redondo Dome, Valles Caldera, New Mexico, Journal of Geophysical Research, v. 91, p. 1867-1886.
- Ingle, J. C. Jr. (1982) Microfaunal evidence of age and depositional environments of the Cerro Prieto section (Plio-Pleistocene), Baja California, Mexico, Report LBL-13897, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, Berkeley, California.
- James, E. D., V. T. Hoang and I. J. Epperson (1987) Structure, permeability and production characteristics of the Heber, California geothermal field, Proceedings of the Twelfth Workshop on Geothermal Reservoir Engineering, Stanford University, California, p. 267-271.
- Keskinen, M. and J. Sternfeld (1982) Hydrothermal alteration and tectonic setting of intrusive rocks from East Brawley, Imperial Valley: an application of petrology to geothermal reservoir analysis, Proceedings of the Eighth Workshop on Geothermal Reservoir Engineering, Stanford University, California, p. 39-44.
- Klusman, R. W. and R. A. Landress (1978) Secondary controls on mercury in soils of geothermal areas, Journal of Geochemical Exploration, v. 9, p. 75-91.
- Klusman, R. W. and R. A. Landress, (1979) Mercury in soils of the Long Valley, California geothermal system, Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research, v. 5, p. 49-65.
- Liou, J. G., Y. Seki, R. Guillmette and H. Sakai, (1985) Compositions and parageneses of secondary minerals in the Onikobe geothermal system, Japan, Chemical Geology, v. 49, p. 1-20.
- Lippmann, M. J. and A. Manon (1987) The Cerro Prieto geothermal field, Geothermal Science and Technology, v. 1, p. 1-38.
- Mahon W. A. J. (1970) Chemistry in the exploration and exploitation of hydrothermal systems, in U. N. Symposium on

- the Development and Utilization of Geothermal Resources, Pisa, 1970, Geothermics, Special Issue 2, p. 1310-1322.
- Matlick, J. S. and P. R. Buseck (1976) A new exploration method for geothermal sources using mercury; Proceedings of the Second U.N. Symposium on the Development and Use of Geothermal Resources, p. 785-792.
- Mahon, W. A. J., L. E. Klyen, and M. Rhode (1980) Neutral sodium/bicarbonate/sulfate hot waters in geothermal systems, Chinetsu (Journal of the Japan Geothermal Energy Association), v. 17, p. 11-24.
- McDowell, S. D. and W. A. Elders (1979) Geothermal metamorphism of sandstone in the Salton Sea geothermal system, in Geology and Geothermics of the Salton Sea Trough, W. A. Elders, ed., Campus Museum Contribution No. 5, University of California, Riverside, p. 70-76.
- McKibben M. A., A. E. Williams, J. P. Andes Jr., C. S. Oakes, S. Okubo and W. A. Elders (1986) Metamorphosed Plio-Pleistocene evaporites in the Salton Sea geothermal field, Salton Trough Rift, California (abs.), Geological Society of America Abstracts with Programs, v. 18, p. 690.
- Moore, J. N. and M. C. Adams (1988), Evolution of the thermal cap in two wells from the Salton Sea geothermal system, California, Geothermics, in press.
- Morse, J. G. and L. D. Thorsen (1978) Reservoir engineering study of a portion of the Salton Sea geothermal field, Transactions Geothermal Resources Council, v. 2, p. 471-474.
- Muffler, L. J. P. and B. R. Doe (1968) Composition and mean age of detritus of the Colorado River delta in the Salton Trough, southeastern California, Journal of Sedimentary Petrology, v. 38, p. 384-399.
- Muffler, L. J. P. and D. E. White (1969) Active metamorphism of upper Cenozoic sediments in the Salton Trough, southeastern California, Geological Society of America Bulletin, v. 80, p. 157-182.
- Nielson, D. L. (1978) Radon emanometry as a geothermal exploration technique: theory and example from Roosevelt Hot Springs KGRA, Utah, University of Utah Research Institute, Earth Science Laboratory Report No. 14, Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Randall, W. (1974) An analysis of the subsurface structure and stratigraphy of the Salton Sea geothermal anomaly, Imperial County, California, Ph.D thesis, University of California, Riverside.
- Robinson, P. T., W. A. Elders and L. J. P. Muffler (1976) Quaternary volcanism in the Salton Sea geothermal field, Geological Society of America Bulletin, v. 87, p. 347-360.
- Schoen, R., D. E. White, and J. J. Hemley, (1974) Argillization by descending acid at Steamboat Springs, Nevada, Clays and Clay Minerals, v. 22, p. 1-22.
- Sharp, R. V. (1982) Tectonic setting of the Imperial Valley region, U. S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1254. p. 5-14.
- Steiner, A. (1968) Clay minerals in hydrothermally altered rocks

- at Wairakei, New Zealand, *Clays and Clay Mineralogy*, v. 16, p. 193-213.
- Steiner, A. (1977) The Wairakei geothermal area, North Island, New Zealand, *New Zealand Geological Survey Bulletin*, v. 90, p. 1-136.
- Truesdell, A. H., J. M. Thompson, T. B. Coplan, N. L. Nehring and C. K. Janik (1981) The origin of the Cerro Prieto geothermal brine, *Geothermics*, v. 10, p. 225-238.
- Van de Kamp, P. C. (1973) Holocene continental sedimentation in the Salton Basin, California, *Geological Society of America Bulletin*, v. 84, p. 827-848.
- Varekamp, J. C. and P. R. Buseck, (1984) Changing mercury anomalies in Long Valley, California; indication for magma movement or seismic activity, *Geology*, v. 12, p. 283-286.
- White, D. E. (1968) Environments of generation of some base metal ore deposits, *Economic Geology*, v. 63, p. 301-335.
- White, D. E., L. J. P. Muffler, and A. H. Truesdell (1971) Vapor-dominated hydrothermal systems compared with hot water systems, *Economic Geology*, v. 66, p. 75-97.
- Yunker L. W., P. W. Kasameyer and J. D. Tewhey (1982) Geological, geophysical, and thermal characteristics of the Salton Sea geothermal field, California, *Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Resources*, v. 12, p. 221-258.

leum industry (Snyder and Fleming, 1985, this issue) is available to the high-temperature geothermal industry.

Borehole geophysics

Borehole geophysics has not undergone the development required even to assess its potential contribution to geothermal development. VSP techniques have emerged as being important in petroleum exploration, and development for these purposes will be important in geothermal application. Electrical borehole techniques have neither been developed nor seriously applied, although some numerical modeling capability exists to assess their contribution. Seismic geotomography is in the research and development stage, and its analog, electrical geotomography, has received virtually no effort. We believe that the borehole techniques are fertile ground for research and development.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Charles M. Swift, Jr. and Joseph N. Moore for their timely review and helpful suggestions for improvement of the manuscript. This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy under contracts DE-AC07-80ID12079 and DE-AC03-84SF12196. Joan Pingree typed the many drafts of this manuscript, while Patrick Daubner coordinated the illustrations. We are grateful to both of them.

REFERENCES

- Ackermann, H. D., 1979, Seismic refraction study of the Raft River geothermal area, Idaho: *Geophysics*, **44**, 216-225.
- Anderson, L. A., and Johnson, G. R., 1976, Application of the self-potential method to geothermal exploration in Long Valley, California: *J. Geophys. Res.*, **81**, 1527-1532.
- Applegate, J. K., Goebel, V. S., Kallenberger, P., and Rossow, J., 1981, The use of seismic reflection techniques in geothermal areas throughout the U.S.: Presented at 51st Ann. Internat. Mtg. and Expos., Soc. of Explor. Geophys., Los Angeles.
- Arnorsson, S., Björnsson, A., Gíslason, G., and Gudmundsson, G., 1976, Systematic exploration of the Krisuvik high-temperature area, Reykjanes Peninsula, Iceland: in Proc. Second U.N. Sympos. on the Development and Use of Geoth. Res., San Francisco, **2**, 853-864.
- Bacon, C. R., 1981, Geology and geophysics of the Cascade Range: Presented at 51st Ann. Internat. Mtg. and Expos., Soc. Explor. Geophys., Los Angeles.
- Balch, A. H., Lee, M. W., Miller, J. J., and Ryder, R. T., 1982, The use of vertical seismic profiles in seismic investigation of the earth: *Geophysics*, **47**, 906-918.
- Batchelor, A. S., 1982, The stimulation of a hot dry rock geothermal reservoir in the Cornubian Granite, England: in Proc. Eighth Workshop Geoth. Reservoir Eng., Stanford Univ., Stanford, California; SGP-TR-60.
- Baudu, R., Bernhard, J., Georgel, J. M., Griveau, P., Rugo, R., 1980, Application of d.c. dipolar methods in the Upper Rhinegraben: in *Advances in European and Geoth. Res.*, D. Reidel Co., 823-832.
- Beasley, C. W., and Ward, S. H., 1986, Theoretical borehole-to-borehole and borehole-to-surface resistivity anomalies of geothermal fracture zones: *Geophysics*, **51**, January.
- Berkman, F., and Lange, A. L., 1980, Tuscarora geophysics—preliminary report: Amex Exploration, Inc. internal rep., open filed by Univ. of Utah Res. Inst., Earth Sci. Lab.
- Berkhold, A., 1982, Electromagnetic studies in geothermal regions: Proc. 6th Workshop on Electromagnetic Induction in the Earth and Moon, Dept. Physics, Univ. of Victoria, Canada.
- Beyer, J. H., 1977, Telluric and D.C. resistivity techniques applied to the geophysical investigation of Basin and Range geothermal systems: Univ. of California, Lawrence Berkeley Lab., Rep. LBL-6325.
- Beyer, J. H., Morrison, H. F., and Dey, A., 1976a, Electrical exploration of geothermal systems in the Basin and Range valleys of Nevada, in Proc. Second U.N. Sympos. on the Development and Use of Geoth. Res., San Francisco, **2**, 889-894.
- Beyer, J. H., Dey, A., Liaw, A., Majer, E., McEvilly, T. V., Morrison, H. F., and Wollenberg, H., 1976b, Preliminary open file report, geological and geophysical studies in Grass Valley, Nevada: Univ. of California, Lawrence Berkeley Lab., Rep. LBL-5262.
- Bhattacharyya, B. K., and Leu, L. K., 1975, Analysis of magnetic anomalies over Yellowstone National Park: mapping of Curie-point isothermal surface for geothermal reconnaissance: *J. Geophys. Res.*, **80**, 4461-4465.
- Biehler, S., 1971, Gravity studies in the Imperial Valley, in Cooperative geological-geophysical-geochemical investigations of geothermal resources in the Imperial Valley area of California: Univ. California, Riverside, Education Res. Service, 29-41.
- Birch, F., 1950, Flow of heat in the Front Range, Colorado: *Bull. Geol. Soc. Am.*, **61**, 567-630.
- Bird, D. K., and Norton, D. L., 1981, Theoretical prediction of phase relations among aqueous solutions and minerals: Saltón Sea Geothermal System: *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, **45**, 1479-1493.
- Björnsson, S., 1980, Natural heat saves millions of barrels of oil: *Atlantica and Iceland Rev.*, **18**, 28-37.
- Blackwell, D. D., and Morgan, P., 1976, Geological and geophysical exploration of the Marysville geothermal area, Montana, USA: Proc. 2nd U.N. Sympos. on the Development and Use of Geoth. Res., San Francisco, **2**, 895-902.
- Blackwell, D. D., Steele, J. L., and Brött, C. A., 1980, The terrain effect on terrestrial heat flow: *J. Geophys. Res.*, **85**, 4757-4772.
- Blakeslee, S., 1984, Seismic discrimination of a geothermal field: Cerro Prieto: Lawrence Berkeley Lab., LBL-17859.
- Bodvarsson, G. S., 1982, Mathematical modeling of the behavior of geothermal systems under exploitation: Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of California, Berkeley.
- Bois, P., La Porte, M., Lavergne, M., and Thomas, G., 1972, Well-to-well seismic measurements: *Geophysics*, **37**, 471-480.
- Brace, W. F., 1968, The mechanical effects of pore pressure on the fracturing of rocks: Geol. Survey Canada, paper 68-52.
- Brött, C. A., Blackwell, D. D., and Morgan, P., 1981, Continuation of heat flow data: A method to construct isotherms in geothermal areas: *Geophysics*, **46**, 1732-1744.
- Browne, P. R. L., 1978, Hydrothermal alteration in active geothermal fields: *Annual Review Earth and Plan. Sci.*, **6**, 229-250.
- Carson, C. C., and Allen, A. D., 1984, A program to investigate the engineering feasibility of extracting energy from shallow magma bodies: *Trans., Geoth. Res. Coun.*, **8**, 3-5.
- Cathles, L. M., 1977, An analysis of the cooling of intrusives by ground water convection which includes boiling: *Econ. Geol.*, **72**, 804-826.
- Chapman, D. S., and Pollack, H. N., 1977, Regional geotherms and lithospheric thickness: *Geology*, **5**, 265-268.
- Clacy, G. R. T., 1968, Geothermal ground noise amplitude and frequency spectra in the New Zealand volcanic region: *J. Geophys. Res.*, **73**, 5377-5383.
- Combs, J., 1980, Heat flow in the Coso geothermal area, Inyo County, California: *J. Geophys. Res.*, **85**, 2411-2424.
- Combs, J., and Rotstein, Y., 1976, Microearthquake studies at the Coso geothermal area, China Lake, California: Proc. 2nd U.N. Sympos. on the Development and Use of Geoth. Res., San Francisco, **2**, 909-916.
- Combs, J., and Hadly, D., 1977, Microearthquake investigation of the Mesa geothermal anomaly, Imperial Valley, California: *Geophysics*, **42**, 17-33.
- Corwin, R. F., 1976, Self-potential exploration for geothermal reservoirs: in Proc. 2nd U.N. Sympos. on the Development and Use of Geothermal Res., San Francisco, **2**, 937-946.
- Corwin, R. F., and Hoover, D. B., 1979, The self-potential method in geothermal exploration: *Geophysics*, **44**, 226-245.
- Costain, J. K., Glover, L. III, and Sinha, A. K., 1980, Low temperature geothermal resources in the Eastern United States: *EOS*, **61**, 1-13.
- Couch, R. W., Pitts, G. S., Gemperle, M., Braman, D. E., and Veen, C. A., 1982, Gravity anomalies in the Cascade Range: in Oregon: Structural and thermal implications: Oregon Dept. Geol. Min. Ind., open-file rep. O-82-9.
- Craig, H., 1963, The isotopic geochemistry of water and carbon in geothermal areas, in *Nuclear geology on geothermal areas*, Spoleto: Pisa, Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Laboratoire de Geologia Nucleare.
- Crampin, S., 1978, Seismic wave propagation through a cracked solid: Polarization as a possible dilatancy diagnostic: *Geophys. J.*, **53**, 467-496.
- 1984, Anisotropy in exploration seismics: *First Break*, **2**(3), 19-21.
- Daily, W., 1984, Underground oil-shale retort monitoring using geotomography: *Geophysics*, **49**, 1701-1707.
- Daily, W. D., Lytle, R. J., Laine, E. F., Okada, J. T., and Deadrick, F. J., 1982, Geotomography in oil shale: *J. Geophys. Res.*, **87**, B7, 5507-5515.

- Daniels, J. J., 1983, Hole-to-surface resistivity measurements: *Geophysics*, **48**, 87-97.
- Denlinger, R. P., and Kovach, R. L., 1981, Seismic-reflection investigations at Castle Rock Springs in The Geysers geothermal area: in McLaughlin, R. J., and Donnelly-Nolan, J. M., Eds., *Research in The Geysers-Clear Lake Geothermal Area*, Northern California: U.S.G.S. Prof. Paper 1141, 117-128.
- Dey, A., and Morrison, H. F., 1976, Resistivity modeling for arbitrarily shaped two dimensional structures, Part I: Theoretical formulation: Lawrence Berkeley Lab. Rep. 5223.
- ———, 1977, An analysis of the bipole-dipole method of resistivity surveying: *Geothermics*, **6**, 47-81.
- Dickinson, D. J., 1976, An airborne infrared survey of the Tauhara Geothermal Field, New Zealand: in Proc. 2nd U.N. Sympos. on the Development and Use of Geoth. Res., San Francisco, **2**, 955-961.
- Dobecki, T. L., 1980, Borehole resistivity curves near spheroidal masses: *Geophysics*, **45**, 1513-1521.
- Douze, E. G., and Sorrells, G. G., 1972, Geothermal ground noise surveys: *Geophysics*, **37**, 813-824.
- Duffield, W. A., and Bacon, C. R., 1977, Preliminary geologic map of the Coso volcanic field and adjacent areas, Inyo County, California, with a table of new K/Ar dates by G. B. Dalrymple: U.S.G.S., open-file rep. 77-311, scale 1:50,000.
- Duffield, W. A., Bacon, C. R., and Dalrymple, G. B., 1980, Late Cenozoic volcanism, geochronology, and structure of the Coso Range, Inyo County, California: *J. Geophys. Res.*, **85**, 2381-2404.
- Dupis, A., Marie, P., and Petian, G., 1980, Magnetotelluric prospecting of the Mont Dore area, in: *Advances in European Geoth. Res.*: D. Reidel, 935-943.
- Dyck, A. M., and Young, R. P., 1985, Physical characterization of rock masses using borehole methods: *Geophysics*, **50**, 2530-2541.
- Edquist, R. K., 1981, Geophysical investigations of the Baltazor Hot Springs Known Geothermal Resource Area and the Painted Hills thermal area, Humboldt County, Nevada: Univ. of Utah Res. Inst., Earth Science Lab. Rep. DOE/ID/12079-29.
- Elders, W. A., Hoagland, J. R., McDowell, S. D., and Cobo, R. J. M., 1978, Hydrothermal mineral zones in the geothermal reservoir of Cerro Prieto: in Proc., First Sympos. on the Cerro Prieto geothermal field, Baja, California, Mexico, September, 1978: Lawrence Berkeley Lab., LBL-7098, 68-75.
- Ellis, A. J., and Mahon, W. A. J., 1977, Chemistry and geothermal systems: Academic Press Inc.
- Fehler, M., Turpening, R., Blackway, C., and Meilen, M., 1982, Detection of a hydrofrac with shear wave vertical seismic profiles: Presented at 52nd Ann. Internat. Mtg. and Expos., Soc. Expl. Geophys., Dallas.
- Fischer, W. A., Davis, B. A., and Souza, T., 1966, Fresh water springs of Hawaii from infrared images: U.S. Geol. Surv. Hydrologic Atlas, HA-218.
- Flovenz, O. G., and Georgeson, L. S., 1982, Prospecting for near vertical aquifers in low-temperature geothermal areas in Iceland: *Geoth. Res. Council, Trans.*, **6**, 19-22.
- Fox, R. C., 1978a, Dipole-dipole resistivity survey of a portion of the Coso Hot Springs KGRA, Inyo County, California: Univ. of Utah Res. Inst., Earth Sci. Lab., Rep. ID0/77.5.6.
- ———, 1978b, Low-altitude aeromagnetic survey of a portion of the Coso Hot Springs KGRA, Inyo County, California: Univ. of Utah Res. Inst., Earth Sci. Lab., Rep. ID0/77.5.7.
- Fox, R. C., Ross, H. P., and Wright, P. M., 1978, Dipole-dipole resistivity survey of a portion of the Coso Hot Springs KGRA, Inyo County, California: Presented at the 48th Ann. Internat. Mtg. and Expos., Soc. Explor. Geophys., San Francisco.
- Frangos, W., and Ward, S. H., 1980, Bipole-dipole survey at Roosevelt Hot Springs thermal area, Beaver County, Utah: Univ. of Utah Res. Inst., Earth Sci. Lab., Rep. DOE/ID/12079-15.
- Furumoto, A. S., 1976, A coordinated exploration program for geothermal sources on the island of Hawaii: in Proc., Second United Nations Sympos. on the Development and Use of Geoth. Res., San Francisco, **2**, 993-1003.
- Galbraith, R. M., 1978, Geological and geophysical analysis of Coso Geothermal Exploration Hole No 1 (CGE-1), Coso Hot Springs KGRA, California: Univ. of Utah Res. Inst., Earth Sci. Lab. Rep. DOE/ID/78-1701.b.4.2.
- Galperin, E. I., 1973, Vertical seismic profiling: Soc. Explor. Geophys.
- Gamble, T. D., Goubau, W. M., Goldstein, N. E., and Clarke, J., 1980, Referenced magnetotellurics at Cerro Prieto: *Geothermics*, **9**, 49-63.
- Gertson, R. C., and Smith, R. B., 1979, Interpretation of a seismic refraction profile across the Roosevelt Hot Springs, Utah and vicinity: Univ. of Utah, Dept. Geol. and Geophys., Rep. ID0/78-1701.a.3.
- Glenn, W. E., and Hulen, J. B., 1979, A study of well logs from Roosevelt Hot Springs KGRA, Utah: in Soc. Prof. Well Log-Analyst's 20th Ann. Logging Sympos. Trans., paper H.
- Glenn, W. E., and Ross, H. P., 1982, A study of well logs from Cove Fort-Sulphurdale KGRA, Utah: Univ. of Utah, Res. Inst., Earth Sci. Lab., Rep. 75.
- Goldstein, N. E., and Mozley, E., 1978, A telluric-magnetotelluric survey at Mount Hood, Oregon: Univ. California, Lawrence Berkeley Lab. Rep. LBL-7050.
- Goldstein, N. E., Norris, R. A., and Wilt, M. J., 1978, Assessment of surface geophysical methods in geothermal exploration and recommendations for future research: Univ. California, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, Rep. LBL-6815.
- Goldstein, N. E., and Paulsson, B., 1976, Interpretation of gravity surveys in Grass and Buena Vista Valleys, Nevada: *Geothermics*, **7**, 29-50.
- Goldstein, N. E., Mozley, E., and Wilt, M., 1982, Interpretation of shallow electrical features from electromagnetic and magnetotelluric surveys at Mount Hood, Oregon: *J. Geophys. Res.*, **87**, 2815-2828.
- Grannell, R. B., 1980, The use of surface gravity methods in monitoring subsurface reservoir changes, with case studies at Cerro Prieto, Mexico, and Heber, California: *Trans., Geoth. Res. Council*, **4**, 49-52.
- Grasty, R. L., Glynn, J. E., and Grant, J. A., 1985, The analysis of multi-channel airborne gamma-ray spectra: *Geophysics*, **50**, this issue, 2611-2620.
- Grindly, G. W., and Browne, P. R. L., 1976, Structural and hydrological factors controlling the permeabilities of some hot-water geothermal fields: in Proc. Second United Nations Sympos. on the Development and Use of Geoth. Res., San Francisco, **1**, 377-386.
- Gupta, H. K., Ward, R. W., and Lin, T.-L., 1982, Seismic wave velocity investigation at The Geysers-Clear Lake geothermal field, California: *Geophysics*, **47**, 819-824.
- Halfman, S. E., Lippmann, M. J., and Zelwer, R., 1982, The movement of geothermal fluid in the Cerro Prieto field as determined from well log and reservoir engineering data, in Proc. 8th Workshop Geoth. Reservoir Eng., Stanford Univ., Stanford, California, SGP-TR-60.
- Halfman, S. E., Lippmann, M. J., Zelwer, R., and Howard, J. H., 1984, Geologic interpretation of geothermal fluid movement in Cerro Prieto Field, Baja, California, Mexico: *Bull., Am. Assn. Petr. Geol.*, **68**, 18-30.
- Hamilton, R. M., and Muffler, L. J. P., 1972, Microearthquakes at The Geysers geothermal area, California: *J. Geophys. Res.*, **77**, 2081-2086.
- Hatherton, T., MacDonald, W. J. P., and Thomson, G. E. K., 1966, Geophysical methods in geothermal prospecting in New Zealand: *Bull. Volcan.*, 485-497.
- Helgeson, H. C., 1968, Geologic and thermodynamic characteristics of the Salton Sea geothermal system: *Am. J. Sci.*, **266**, 129-166.
- Henley, R. W., and Ellis, A. J., 1983, Geothermal systems ancient and modern, a geochemical review: *Earth Sci. Rev.*, **19**, 1-50.
- Hernance, J. F., Thayer, R. E., Björnsson, A., 1976, The telluric-magnetotelluric method in the regional assessment of geothermal potential, in Proc. 2nd U.N. Sympos. on the Development and Use of Geoth. Res., San Francisco, **2**, 1037-1048.
- Hill, D. P., 1976, Structures of Long Valley Caldera, California, from a seismic refraction experiment: *J. Geophys. Res.*, **81**, 745-753.
- Hill, D. G., Layman, E. G., Swift, G. M., Jr., and Yungul, S. H., 1979, Soda Lake, Nevada, thermal anomaly: *Trans., Geoth. Res. Council*, **3**, 305-308.
- Hill, D. P., Mooney, W. D., Fuis, G. S., and Healy, J. H., 1981, Evidence on the structure and tectonic environment of the volcanoes in the Cascade Range, Oregon and Washington, from seismic refraction/reflection measurements: Presented at the 51st Ann. Internat. Mtg. and Expos., Soc. Explor. Geophys., Los Angeles.
- Hochstein, M. P., and Hunt, T. M., 1970, Seismic, gravity, and magnetic studies, Broadlands geothermal field, New Zealand, in Proc. U.N. Sympos. on the Development and Utilization of Geoth. Res., Pisa, *Geothermics Spec. Issue 2*, **2**, 333-346.
- Hohmann, G. W., and Ward, S. H., 1981, Electrical methods in mining geophysics: *Econ. Geol.*, 75th Anniversary Volume, 806-828.
- Hoover, D. B., and Long, C. L., 1976, Audiomagnetotelluric methods in reconnaissance geothermal exploration: Proc. 2nd U.N. Sympos. on the Development and Use of Geoth. Res., San Francisco, **2**, 1059-1064.
- Hoover, D. B., Long, C. L., and Senterfi, R. M., 1978, Some results from audiomagnetotelluric investigations in geothermal areas: *Geophysics*, **43**, 1501-1514.
- Hulen, J. B., 1978, Geology and alteration of the Coso geothermal area, Inyo County, California: Univ. of Utah Res. Inst., Earth Sci. Lab. Rep. DOE/ID/28392-4.
- Hunt, T. M., and Lattan, J. H., 1982, A survey of seismic activity near Wairakei geothermal field, New Zealand: *J. Volcan. and Geoth. Res.*, **14**, 319-334.
- Isherwood, W. F., 1976, Complete Bouguer gravity map of The Geysers

- sers area, California: U.S. Geol. Surv. open-file rep., 76-357.
- Isherwood, W. F., and Mabey, D. R., 1978, Evaluation of Baltazor known geothermal resource area, Nevada: *Geothermics*, 7, 221-229.
- Iyer, H. M., and Hitchcock, T., 1976, Seismic noise as a geothermal exploration tool: techniques and results, in *Proc. 2nd U.N. Sympos. on the Development and Use of Geoth. Res.*, San Francisco, 2, 1075-1083.
- Iyer, H. M., and Stewart, R. M., 1977, Teleseismic technique to locate magma in the crust and upper mantle, in Dick, H. J. B., Ed., *Magma genesis: Oregon Dept. of Geol. and Min. Ind., Bull.* 96, 281-299.
- Iyer, H. M., Oppenheimer, D. H., and Hitchcock, T., 1979, Abnormal P-wave delays in The Geysers-Clear Lake geothermal area, California: *Science*, 204, 495.
- Jackson, D. B., O'Donnell, J. E., and Gregory, D. I., 1977, Schlumberger soundings, audio-magnetotelluric soundings and telluric mapping in and around the Coso Range, California: U.S. Geol. Surv. open-file rep. 77-120.
- Jackson, D. B., and O'Donnell, J. E., 1980, Reconnaissance electrical surveys in the Coso Range, California: *J. Geophys. Res.*, 85, 2502-2516.
- Jiracek, G. R., and Smith, C., 1976, Deep resistivity investigations at two known geothermal resource areas (KGRAs) in New Mexico: Radium Springs and Lightning Dock: *New Mexico Geol. Soc. Spec. Pub.*, 6, 71-76.
- Kane, M. F., Mabey, D. R., and Brace, R., 1976, A gravity and magnetic investigation of the Long Valley Caldera, Mono County, California: *J. Geophys. Res.*, 81, 754-762.
- Kappelmeyer, O., and Haenel, R., 1974, *Geothermics with special reference to application: Geoexploration Monograph Ser. 1, 4*, Gebrüder-Borntraeger.
- Kauahikaua, J., 1981, Interpretation of time-domain electromagnetic soundings in the East Rift geothermal area of Kilauea volcano, Hawaii: U.S. Geol. Surv. open-file rep. 81-979.
- Keller, G. V., 1970, Induction methods in prospecting for hot water, in *Proc. U.N. Sympos. on the Development and Utilization of Geoth. Res.*, Pisa, *Geothermics Spec. Issue 2*, 2, 318-332.
- Keller, G. V., and Rapolla, A., 1974, Electrical prospecting methods in volcanic areas: in Civetta, L., Gasparini, P., Luongo, G., and Rapolla, A., Eds., *Physical volcanology: Elsevier Science Publishers*.
- Keller, G. V., Furgerson, R. Lee, C. Y., Harthill, N., and Jacobson, J. J., 1975, The dipole mapping method: *Geophysics*, 40, 451-472.
- Keller, G. V., Skokan, C. V., Skokan, J. J., Daniels, J., Kauahikaua, J. P., Klein, D. P., and Zablocki, C. J., 1977, Geo-electric studies on the east rift, Kilauea Volcano, Hawaii Island: *Hawaii Inst. Geophys. Rep. HIG-77-15*.
- Keller, G. V., Taylor, K., and Santo, J. M., 1981, Megasource EM method for detecting deeply buried conductive zones in geothermal exploration: Presented at the 51st Ann. Internat. Mtg. and Expos., Soc. Explor. Geophys., Los Angeles.
- Keys, W. S., and Sullivan, J. K., 1979, Role of borehole geophysics in defining the physical characteristics of the Raft River geothermal reservoir, Idaho: *Geophysics*, 44, 1116-1141.
- Killpack, T. J., and Hohmann, G. W., 1979, Interactive dipole-dipole resistivity and IP modeling of arbitrary two-dimensional structures (IP2D user's guide and documentation): *Univ. Utah Res. Inst., Earth Sci. Lab. Rep.*, 15.
- Kintzinger, P. R., 1956, Geothermal survey of hot ground near Lordsburg, New Mexico: *Science*, 124, 629-630.
- Koenig, J. B., Gawarecki, S. J., and Austin C. G., 1972, Remote sensing survey of the Coso geothermal area, Inyo County, California: *Naval Weapons Center Tech. Publ.* 5233, China Lake, CA.
- Lachenbruch, A. H., 1978, Heat flow in the Basin and Range Province and thermal effects of tectonic extension: *Pure and Appl. Geophys.*, 117, 34-50.
- Lachenbruch, A. H., Sorey, M. L., Lewis, R. E., and Sass, J. H., 1976, The near-surface hydrothermal regime of Long Valley caldera: *J. Geophys. Res.*, 81, 763-768.
- Lager, D. L., and Lytle, R. J., 1977, Determining a subsurface electromagnetic profile from high-frequency measurements by applying reconstruction technique algorithms: *Radio Sci.*, 12, 249-260.
- Lange, A. L., and Westphal, W. H., 1969, Microearthquakes near The Geysers, Sonoma County, California: *J. Geophys. Res.*, 74, 4377-4382.
- Laster, S. J., 1985, The present state of seismic acquisition: one view: *Geophysics*, 50, this issue, 2443-2451.
- Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, 1984, Proposed scientific activities for the Salton Sea Scientific Drilling Project: A report of the experiments panel: Lawrence Berkeley Lab., Univ. of California, Rep. LBL-17716.
- Lebedev, E. B., and Khitarov, N. I., 1964, Dependence on the beginning of melting of granite and the electrical conductivity of its melt on high water vapor pressure: *Geokhimija*, 3, 195-201.
- Lee, T.-C., and Cohen, L. H., 1979, Onshore and offshore measurements of temperature gradients in the Salton Sea Geothermal Area, California: *Geophysics*, 44, 206-215.
- LeSchack, L. A., Lewis, J. E., and Chang, D. C., 1977, Reconnaissance of geothermal prospects using shallow temperature surveys: LeSchack Associates, Ltd. Tech. Rep. to Dept. of Energy.
- LeSchack, L. A., and Lewis, J. E., 1983, Geothermal prospecting with Shallo-Temp surveys: *Geophysics*, 48, 975-996.
- Lezama, G. F., 1984, On Schlumberger soundings and head-on measurements: U.N. Univ. Geothermal Training Programme, Iceland, Rep. 1984-9.
- Liaw, A. L., and McEvelly, T. V., 1979, Microseisms in geothermal exploration—Studies in Grass Valley, Nevada: *Geophysics*, 44, 1097-1115.
- Liaw, A., and Suyenaga, W., 1982, Detection of geothermal microtremors using seismic arrays: Presented at 52nd Ann. Internat. Mtg. and Expos., Soc. of Explor. Geophys., Dallas.
- Lovering, T. S., and Goode, H. D., 1963, Measuring geothermal gradients in drill holes less than 60 feet deep, East Tintic District, Utah: U.S. Geol. Surv. Bull. 1172.
- Lumb, F. T., and MacDonald, W. J. P., 1970, Near-surface resistivity surveys of geothermal areas using the electromagnetic method: in U.N. Sympos. on Development and Utilization of Geoth. Res., Pisa, *Geothermics Spec. Issue 2*, 311-317.
- Mabey, D. R., Hoover, D. B., O'Donnell, J. E., and Wilson, C. W., 1978, Reconnaissance geophysical studies of the geothermal system in southern Raft River Valley, Idaho: *Geophysics*, 43, 1470-1484.
- MacDonald, W. J. P., and Muffler, L. J. P., 1972, Recent geophysical exploration of the Kawerau geothermal field, North Island, New Zealand: *New Zealand J. Geol. and Geophys.*, 18.
- Mahon, W. A. J., Klyen, L. E., and Rhode, M., 1980, Neutral sodium/bicarbonate/sulfate hot waters in geothermal systems: *Chinetsu (J. of the Japan Geothermal Energy Assn.)*, 17, 11-24.
- Majer, E. L., 1978, Seismological investigations in geothermal regions: Univ. of California, Lawrence Berkeley Lab., Rep. LBL-7054.
- Majer, E. L., and McEvelly, T. V., 1979, Seismological investigations at The Geysers geothermal field: *Geophysics*, 44, 246-249.
- Martinez, M., Fabrial, H., and Romo, J. M., 1982, Magnetotelluric studies in the geothermal area of Culiacan, Mexico: Sixth Workshop on Electromagnetic Induction in the Earth and Moon, Internat. Ass'n. Geomag. and Aeron., Victoria, British Columbia, Dept. of Physics, Univ. of Victoria (abstr).
- McNitt, J. R., 1976, Summary of United Nations geothermal exploration experience, 1965 to 1975: in *Proc. 2nd U.N. Sympos. on the Development and Use of Geoth. Res.*, San Francisco, 2, 1127-1134.
- Meidav, T., and Tonani, F., 1976, A critique of geothermal exploration techniques: *Proc. 2nd U.N. Sympos. on the Development and Use of Geoth. Res.*, San Francisco, 2, 1143-1154.
- Moore, J. N., Adams, M. C., and Stauder, J. J., 1985, Geologic and geochemical investigations of the Meager Creek geothermal system, British Columbia, Canada: *Proc. Tenth Workshop on Geoth. Res. Eng.*, Stanford Univ., Stanford, CA.
- Morrison, H. F., Goldstein, N. E., Hoversten, M., Oppliger, G., and Riveros, C., 1978, Description, field test, and data analysis of a controlled-source EM system (EM-60): Univ. of California, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, Rep. LBL-7088.
- Moskowitz, B., and Norton, D., 1977, A preliminary analysis of intrinsic fluid and rock resistivity in active hydrothermal systems: *J. Geophys. Res.*, 82, 5787-5795.
- Muffler, L. J. P., and White, D. E., 1969, Active metamorphism of Upper Cenozoic sediments in the Salton Sea geothermal field and the Salton Trough, southeastern California: *Bull., Geol. Soc. Am.*, 80, 157-182.
- Musmann, G., Gramkow, B., Lohr, V., and Kertz, W., 1980, Magnetotelluric survey of the Lake Laach (Eifel) volcanic area: *Advances in European Geoth. Res.*: D. Reidel Co., 904-910.
- Nabighian, M. N., Oppliger, G. L., Edwards, R. N., Lo, B. B. H., and Chessman, S. J., 1984, Cross-hole magnetometric resistivity (MMR): *Geophysics*, 49, 1313-1326.
- Newman, G. A., Wannamaker, P. E., and Hohmann, G. W., 1985, On the detectability of crustal magma chambers using the magnetotelluric method: *Geophysics*, 50, 1136-1143.
- Nielson, D. L., 1978, Radon emanometry as a geothermal exploration technique; theory and an example from Roosevelt Hot Springs KGRA Utah: *Univ. Utah Res. Inst., Earth Sci. Lab. Rep. No.* 14.
- Noble, J. W., and Ojiambo, S. B., 1976, Geothermal exploration in Kenya: *Proc. 2nd U.N. Sympos. on the Development and Use of Geoth. Res.*, 1, 189-204.
- Norton, D. L., 1984, Theory of hydrothermal systems: *Ann. Rev. Earth Plan., Sci.*, 12, 155-177.
- Nur, A., and Simmons, G., 1969, The effect of saturation on velocity in low porosity rocks: *Earth Plan. Sci. Lett.*, 7, 183-193.
- Okubo, Y., Graf, R. J., Hansen, R. O., Ogawa, K., and Tsu, H., 1985, Curie point depths of the Island of Kyushu and surrounding areas, Japan: *Geophysics*, 50, 481-494.

- Olmstead, F. H., 1977, Use of temperature surveys at a depth of 1 meter in geothermal exploration in Nevada: U.S. Geol. Surv. Prof. Paper, 1044-B.
- Oppenheimer, D. H., and Iyer, H. M., 1980, Frequency-wavenumber analysis of geothermal microseisms at Norris Geyser basin, Yellowstone National Park, Wyoming: *Geophysics*, 45, 952-963.
- Oristaglio, M. L., 1985, A guide to the current uses of vertical seismic profiles: *Geophysics*, 50, this issue, 2473-2479.
- Paillet, F. L., 1980, Acoustic propagation in the vicinity of fractures which intersect a fluid-filled borehole: Presented at the 21st Ann. Logging Sympos., Soc. Prof. Well Log Analysts, Lafayette, LA, DD1-DD33.
- Palmason, G., 1976, Geophysical methods in geothermal exploration: Proc. 2nd U.N. Sympos. on the Development and Use of Geoth. Res., San Francisco, 1975, 2, 1175-1184.
- Patella, D., Quarto, R., and Tramacere, A., 1980, Dipole-dipole study of the Travale geothermal field: *Advances in European Geoth. Res.*, D. Reidel Co., 833-842.
- Paterson, N. R., and Reeves, C. V., 1985, Gravity and magnetic surveys: the state-of-the-art in 1985: *Geophysics*, 50, this issue, 2558-2594.
- Polay, J. P., and Van Steveninck, J., 1970, Geothermal prospecting-delineation of shallow salt domes and surface faults by temperature measurements at a depth of approximately 2 meters: *Geophys. Prosp.*, 18, 666-700.
- Rai, C. S., and Manghnani, M. H., 1978, Electrical conductivity of basalts to 1550°C, in Dick, H. J. B., Ed., Proc. of Chapman Conference on Partial Melting in the Earth's Upper Mantle, Oregon, Dept. Geol. and Min. Ind., Bull., 96, 219-232.
- Rapolla, A., and Keller, G. V., Eds., 1984, Geophysics of geothermal areas: State of the art and future development: Proc. of the 3rd Course held at the School of Geophysics, "Ettore Majorana" International Centre for Sci. Culture, Erice, Italy, 1980, Colorado School of Mines Press.
- Razo, A., Arellano, F., and Fouseca, H., 1980, CFE resistivity studies at Cerro Prieto: *Geothermics*, 9, 7-14.
- Reasenbergl, P., Ellsworth, W., and Walter, A., 1980, Teleseismic evidence for a low-velocity body under the Coso geothermal area: *J. Geophys. Res.*, 85, 2471-2483.
- Rijo, L., 1977, Modeling of electric and electromagnetic data: Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of Utah.
- Risk, G. F., MacDonald, W. J. P., and Dawson, G. B., 1970, D.C. resistivity surveys of the Broadlands geothermal region, New Zealand: Proc. U.N. Sympos. on the Development and Utilization of Geoth. Res., Pisa, *Geothermics*, Spec. Issue 2, 2, 287-294.
- Robinson, R., and Iyer, H. M., 1981, Delineation of a low-velocity body under the Roosevelt Hot Springs geothermal area, Utah, using teleseismic P-wave data: *Geophysics*, 46, 1456-1466.
- Ross, H. P., Nielson, D. L., and Moore, J. N., 1982, Roosevelt Hot Springs geothermal system, Utah—Case study: *Bull., Am. Assn. Petr. Geol.*, 66, 879-902.
- Ross, H. P., and Moore, J. N., 1985, Geophysical investigations of the Cove Fort-Sulphurdale geothermal system, Utah: *Geophysics*, 50, November.
- Rundle, J. B., Elbring, G. J., Striker, R. P., Finger, J. T., Carson, C. C., Walck, M. C., Ellsworth, W. L., Hill, D. P., Malin, P., Tono, E., Robertson, M., Kuhlman, S., McEvilly, T., Clymer, R., Smithson, S. B., Deemer, S., Johnson, R., Henyey, T., Hauksson, E., Leary, P., McCrancy, J., and Kissling, E., 1985, Seismic imaging in Long Valley, California, by surface and borehole techniques: An investigation of active tectonics: *EOS*, 66, 194-201.
- Sandberg, S. K., and Höhmann, G. W., 1982, Controlled-source audiomagnetotellurics in geothermal exploration: *Geophysics*, 47, 100-116.
- Sanyal, S. K., Wells, L. E., and Bickham, R. E., 1980, Geothermal well log interpretation state of the art—Final report: Los Alamos Scientific Lab. Rep. LA-8211-MS.
- Sass, J. H., Lachenbruch, A. H., Muirco, R. J., Greene, G. W., and Moses, T. H., Jr., 1971, Heat flow in the western United States: *J. Geophys. Res.*, 76, 6367-6413.
- Sass, J. H., Blackwell, D. D., Chapman, D. S., Costain, J. K., Decker, E. R., Lawver, L. A., and Swanberg, C. A., 1981, Heat flow from the crust of the United States: in Tourlovkian, Y. S., Judd, W. R., Roy, R. F., Eds., *Physical properties of rocks and minerals*: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 503-548.
- Schultz, P. S., 1985, Seismic data processing: current industry practice and new directions: *Geophysics*, 50, this issue, 2452-2457.
- Shankland, T. J., and Waff, H. S., 1977, Partial melting and electrical conductivity anomalies in the upper mantle: *J. Geophys. Res.*, 82, 5409-5417.
- Shuey, R. T., Schellinger, D. K., Tripp, A. C., 1977, Curie depth determination from aeromagnetic data: *Geophys. J. Roy. Astr. Soc.*, 50, 75-101.
- Sill, W. R., 1983, Self-potential modeling from primary flows: *Geophysics*, 48, 76-86.
- Smith, C., 1983, Thermal hydrology and heat flow of Beowawe-geothermal area, Nevada: *Geophysics*, 48, 681-626.
- Smith, L., and Chapman, D. S., 1983, On the thermal effects of groundwater flow, 1, Regional scale systems: *J. Geophys. Res.*, 88, 593-608.
- Smith, M. C., and Ponder, G. M., 1982, Hot dry rock geothermal energy development program annual report fiscal year 1981: Los Alamos Nat. Lab., NM, (LA-9287-HDR).
- Smith, R. J., 1985, Geophysics in Australian mineral exploration: *Geophysics*, 50, this issue, 2637-2665.
- Snyder, D. D., and Fleming, D. B., 1985, Well logging—A 25-year perspective: *Geophysics*, 50, this issue, 2504-2529.
- Souto, J. M., 1978, Oahu geothermal exploration: *Trans. Geoth. Res. Council*, 2, 605-607.
- Stanley, W. D., 1982, Magnetotelluric soundings on the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory facility, Idaho: *J. Geophys. Res.*, 87, 2683-2691.
- Stanley, W. D., Jackson, D. B., and Zohdy, A. A. R., 1976, Deep electrical investigations in the Long Valley geothermal area, California: *J. Geophys. Res.*, 81, 810-820.
- Stanley, W. D., Boehl, J. E., Bostick, F. X., Jr., and Smith, H. W., 1977, Geothermal significance of magnetotelluric sounding in the eastern Snake River Plain-Yellowstone region: *J. Geophys. Res.*, 82, 2501-2514.
- Steeple, D. W., and Iyer, H. M., 1976a, Low-velocity zone under Long Valley as determined from teleseismic events: *J. Geophys. Res.*, 81, 849-860.
- 1976b, Teleseismic P-wave delays in geothermal exploration: in Proc. 2nd U.N. Sympos. on the Development and Use of Geoth. Res., San Francisco, 2, 1199-1206.
- Stolt, R. H., and Weglein, A. B., 1985, Migration and inversion of seismic data: *Geophysics*, 50, 2458-2472.
- Studd, F. E., 1964, Geophysical prospecting in New Zealand's hydrothermal fields: in Proc., United Nations Conf. on New Sources of Energy, 2, 380.
- Swanberg, C. A., 1976, The Mesa geothermal anomaly, Imperial Valley, California: A comparison and evaluation of results obtained from surface geophysics and deep drilling: Proc. 2nd U.N. Sympos. on the Development and Use of Geoth. Res., San Francisco, 2, 1217-1229.
- Swift, C. M., Jr., 1979, Geophysical data, Beowawe geothermal area, Nevada: *Trans. Geoth. Res. Council*, 3, 701-703.
- Tripp, A. C., Ward, S. H., Sill, W. R., Swift, C. M., Jr., and Petrick, W. R., 1978, Electromagnetic and Schlumberger resistivity sounding in the Roosevelt Hot Springs KGRA: *Geophysics*, 43, 1450-1469.
- Varet, J., 1982, Géothermie basse-énergie: Usage direct de la chaleur: Masson.
- Wallace, R. H., Jr., Kraemer, T. F., Taylor, R. E., and Wesselman, J. B., 1979, Assessment of geopressured-geothermal resources in the Northern Gulf of Mexico Basin: in Muffler, L. J. P., Ed., *Assessment of Geoth. Res. of the U.S.*, Geol. Surv. Circular 790.
- Walter, A. W., and Weaver, C. S., 1980, Seismic studies in the Coso geothermal area, Inyo County, California: *J. Geophys. Res.*, 85, 2441-2458.
- Wannamaker, P. E., Ward, S. H., Hohmann, G. W., and Sill, W. R., 1980, Magnetotelluric models of the Roosevelt Hot Springs thermal area, Utah: Univ. of Utah Res. Inst., Earth Science Lab., Rep. DOE/ET/27002-8.
- Ward, P. L., and Björnsson, S., 1971, Microearthquake swarms and the geothermal areas of Iceland: *J. Geophys. Res.*, 76, 3953-3982.
- Ward, R. W., Butler, D., Iyer, H. M., Laster, S., Lattanner, A., Majer, E., and Mass, J., 1979, Seismic Methods, in Nielson, D. L., Ed., *Program Review Geoth. Explor. and Assessment Tech. Program*, Rep. DOE/ET/27002-6, Univ. of Utah Res. Inst., Earth Sci. Lab.
- Ward, S. H., 1983a, Controlled source electromagnetic methods in geothermal exploration: U.N. Univ. Geothermal Training Programme, Iceland, Rep. 1983-4.
- 1983b, Geophysical studies of active geothermal systems in the northern Basin and Range: *Geoth. Res. Council, Spec. Rep. No. 13*, 121-157.
- Ward, S. H., Parry, W. T., Nash, W. P., Sill, W. R., Cook, K. L., Smith, R. B., Chapman, D. S., Brown, F. H., Whelan, J. A., and Bowman, J. R., 1978, A summary of the geology, geochemistry, and geophysics of the Roosevelt Hot Springs thermal area, Utah: *Geophysics*, 43, 1515-1542.
- Ward, S. H., and Sill, W. R., 1983, Resistivity, induced polarization, and self-potential methods in geothermal exploration: Univ. of Utah Res. Inst., Earth Sci. Lab., Rep. DOE/ID/12079-90.
- Ward, S. H., and Wannamaker, P. E., 1983, The MT/AMT electromagnetic method in geothermal exploration: U.N. Univ. Geothermal Training Programme, Iceland, Rep. 1983-5.
- Wechsler, D. J., and Smith, R. B., 1979, An evaluation of hypocenter location techniques with applications to Southern Utah: Regional earthquake distributions and seismicity of geothermal areas: Univ. of Utah, Dept. of Geol. and Geophys., Rep. IDO/DOE/ET/28392.

32.
 West, G. F., and Edwards, R. N., 1985, A simple parametric model for the electromagnetic response of an anomalous body in a host medium: *Geophysics*, **50**, this issue, 2542-2557.
- White, D. E., 1965, Geothermal energy: U.S. Geol. Surv. Circ. 519.
- 1969, Rapid heat-flow surveying of geothermal areas, utilizing individual snowfalls as colorimeters: *J. Geophys. Res.*, **74**, 5191-5201.
- White, D. E., Muffler, L. J. P., and Truesdell, A. H., 1971, Vapor-dominated hydrothermal systems compared with hot water systems: *Econ. Geol.*, **66**, 75-97.
- White, D. E., and Williams, D. L., Eds., 1975, Assessment of geothermal resources of the United States-1975: *Geol. Surv. Circ.* 726.
- Williams, D. L., and Von Herzen, R. P., 1974, Heat loss from the Earth: New estimate: *Geology*, **2**, 327-328.
- Williams, D. L., and Finn, C., 1982, Evidence from gravity data on the location and size of subvolcanic intrusions: Preliminary results (abstr.): *Geophysics*, **47**, 425.
- Williams, P. D., Mabey, D. R., Zohdy, A. R., Ackermann, H., Hoover, D. B., Pierce, K. L., Oriel, S. S., 1976, Geology and geophysics of the southern Raft River valley geothermal area, Idaho, USA: *Proc. 2nd U.N. Sympos. on Development and Use of Geoth. Res.*, San Francisco, **2**, 1273-1282.
- Wilt, M. J., Beyer, J. H., and Goldstein, N. E., 1980, A comparison of dipole-dipole resistivity and electromagnetic induction sounding over the Panther Canyon thermal anomaly, Grass Valley, Nevada: *Trans., Geoth. Res. Council*, **4**, 101-104.
- Wilt, M. J., and Goldstein, N. E., 1981, Resistivity monitoring at Cerro Prieto: *Geothermics*, **10**, 183-193.
- Wilt, M. J., Stark, M., Goldstein, N. E., and Haight, J. R., 1981, Electromagnetic induction sounding at geothermal prospects in Nevada: Univ. of California, Lawrence Berkeley Lab., Rep. LBL-12100.
- Wodzicki, A., and Weissburg, B. G., 1970, Structural control of base metal mineralization at the Tui Mine, Te Aroha, New Zealand: *New Zealand J. Geol. and Geophys.*, **13**, 610.
- Wollenburg, H. A., 1976, Radioactivity of geothermal systems: *Proc. 2nd U.N. Sympos. on the Development and Use of Geoth. Res.*, San Francisco, **2**, 1282-1292.
- Wright, P. M., 1981, Gravity and magnetic methods in mineral exploration: *Econ. Geol.*, 75th Anniversary Volume, 829-839.
- Yang, F. W., and Ward, S. H., 1985, Single- and cross-borehole resistivity anomalies of thin ellipsoids and spheroids: *Geophysics*, **50**, 637-655.
- Young, C.-Y., and Ward, R. W., 1980, 3-D Q^{-1} model of Coso Hot Springs, KGRA: *J. Geophys. Res.*, **85**, 2459-2470.
- Zablöcki, C. J., 1976, Mapping thermal anomalies on an active volcano by the self-potential method, Kilauea, Hawaii: *Proc. 2nd U.N. Sympos. on the Development and Use of Geoth. Res.*, San Francisco, **2**, 1299-1309.
- Zandt, G., McPherson, L., Schaff, S., and Olsen, S., 1982, Seismic baseline and induction studies, Roosevelt Hot Springs, Utah and Raft River, Idaho, Final Technical Report: Univ. Utah Research Inst., Earth Sci. Lab., Rep. 100.
- Zoback, M. L., and Anderson, R. E., 1983, Style of Basin and Range faulting as inferred from seismic reflection data in the Great Basin, Nevada and Utah: *Geoth. Res. Council, Spec. Rep. No. 13*.
- Zohdy, A. A. R., Anderson, L. A., and Muffler, L. J. P., 1973, Resistivity, self-potential, and induced polarization surveys of a vapor-dominated geothermal system: *Geophysics*, **38**, 1130-1144.