Tectonic evolution of a Paleozoic thrust fault influences the hydrogeology of a fractured rock aquifer, northeastern Appalachian foreland
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ABSTRACT

In polyorogenic regions, the superposition of structures during a protracted tectonic history produces complex fractured bedrock aquifers. Thrust-faulted regions, in particular, have complicated permeability patterns that affect groundwater flow paths, quantity, and quality. In the Appalachian foreland of northwestern Vermont, numerous bedrock wells that are spatially related to the Paleozoic Hinesburg thrust have elevated naturally occurring radioactivity and/or low yields. The association of groundwater quality and quantity issues with this thrust was a unique opportunity to investigate its structural and hydrogeologic framework. The Hinesburg thrust juxtaposed metamorphic rocks of the hanging wall with sedimentary rocks of the footwall during the Ordovician. It was then deformed by two orthogonal Devonian fold sets and was fractured during the Cretaceous. Median well yields in the hanging wall aquifer are significantly lower than those of the footwall aquifer, consistent with the respective permeability contrast between metamorphic and carbonate rocks. For wells drilled through the Hinesburg thrust, those completed closest (vertically) to the thrust have the highest median yields, whereas others completed farther below have yields in the footwall range. The geochemical signature of the hanging wall and footwall aquifers correlates with their whole-rock geochemistry. The hanging wall aquifer is enriched in alpha radiation, Na+K-Cl, Ba, and Sr, whereas the footwall aquifer is enriched in Ca-Mg-HCO3 and alkalinity. Wells that penetrated the Hinesburg thrust generally have hanging wall geochemical signatures. A simple hydrogeologic model for the permeability evolution of the Hinesburg thrust involves the ductile emplacement of a low-K hanging wall onto a high-K footwall, with subsequent modification by fractures.
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INTRODUCTION

Fractured bedrock aquifers are important groundwater resources in many parts of the world. The hydrogeologic framework of these aquifers is often dominated by anisotropic polydeformed metamorphic rocks where ductile and brittle structures are superposed during a protracted tectonic history (e.g., Gunderson 1991; Seaton & Burbey 2005). In particular, faulted bedrock aquifer systems have complicated permeability patterns that affect groundwater flow paths, quantity, and quality (e.g., Caine et al. 2010; Bense et al. 2013).

In northwestern Vermont, elevated naturally occurring radioactivity (alpha radiation, uranium, and radium) was discovered in groundwater from a bedrock public water supply well (Bazilchuk 2000; Kim & Becker 2001, 2004) and subsequently in numerous private wells drilled into the hanging wall of the Paleozoic Hinesburg thrust fault (Fig. 1). In addition to elevated radioactivity, some proposed housing developments in the same region were
abandoned due to insufficient groundwater quantity, and an increasing number of domestic wells are now being drilled through the Hinesburg thrust into more productive sedimentary rocks of the footwall to meet domestic groundwater demands.

Within fractured rock aquifers, thrust faults have complex permeability patterns that affect groundwater flow paths and consequently groundwater quantity and the distribution and transport of naturally occurring contaminants (e.g., Caine et al. 1996, 2010; Bense et al. 2013). The strong contrast in productivity between wells completed in the footwall versus hanging wall of the Hinesburg thrust also raises new questions about what controls groundwater flow and bedrock aquifer development in this region. Because of multiple generations of ductile and brittle deformation, polyorogenic areas such as the northwestern Vermont foreland are particularly challenging for understanding the physical and chemical controls on groundwater flow around fault zones. However, the coincidence of water quality and quantity problems in bedrock wells that are in close proximity (vertically or horizontally) to the Hinesburg thrust makes this area unique for evaluating the role that this fault plays in both issues. Over the past decade, we devised a multidisciplinary study that incorporates stratigraphy, structural geology, physical hydrogeology, and groundwater and whole-rock geochemistry (including chlorofluorocarbon ages) to approach these issues.

Fig. 1. (A) Bedrock geologic map for the field area that shows the locations of cross-sections, bedrock wells sampled for groundwater chemistry, and major roads. Compiled from Kim et al. (2007), Thompson et al. (2004), and Mehrtens (1997). HT = Hinesburg Thrust; MBT = Muddy Brook Thrust; SGF = St. George Fault; LIT = Lake Iroquois Thrust; ‘d’ and ‘u’ indicate down and up motions on normal fault; thrust faults have teeth on the upper plate; bold white dashed line shows the boundary of the Town of Williston in the field area; the location of Fig. 5 is also shown; shaded relief underlay displays the general topography; first inset map shows the location of the field area in Vermont, whereas the second shows the division of the field area into the Champlain Valley and Green Mountain geologic provinces; and (B) Simplified lithotectonic diagram for the field area that shows the major lithologies (and their ages) in the hanging wall and footwall of the Hinesburg thrust.
Using the previously mentioned disciplines, the objective of this paper is to document the protracted and complex structural evolution of the Hinesburg thrust from the Ordovician to the present and to assess the role that this progression played in the current physical and chemical hydrogeology of this thrust. We will highlight that the Hinesburg thrust formed at depth as a ductile fault (Ordovician), moved a second time after 'locking up', was subsequently deformed twice during the Devonian Acadian orogeny by orthogonal map-scale folds and lastly was pervasively fractured during Cretaceous extensional events. A relatively simple model is envisioned to integrate the hydrogeology and structural geology of the Hinesburg thrust, which involves the ductile emplacement of low-permeability metamorphic rocks of the hanging wall onto high-permeability sedimentary rocks of the footwall. The fault zone interface of mylonites on the hanging wall side and recrystallized and imbricated carbonates on the footwall side likely have the same permeabilities as their respective protoliths. This structural framework allows for a strong contrast in well yields and the downward infiltration of hanging-wall-derived groundwater. The permeability of the hanging wall and thrust zone was likely enhanced by fracture development, which may have been localized by previous episodes of cleavage development.

The building blocks of this study will now be presented in four separate sections entitled Stratigraphy and Tectonics, Structural Geology, Hydrogeology, and Aqueous and Bedrock Geochemistry. Each section is presented in considerable detail and then all are integrated together in the Discussion. The final section is an Epilog, which discusses how this hydrogeological information was used to inform environmental policy.

STRATIGRAPHY AND TECTONICS

In west central Vermont, the gently east-dipping, west-directed Hinesburg thrust is a major tectonic boundary between the Champlain Valley and Green Mountain Geologic provinces (Fig. 1). This thrust fault emplaced late Proterozoic to early Cambrian lower greenschist-facies metasedimentary (muscovite–biotite grade) and metagneous rocks of the hanging wall/east side (Green Mountains) over weakly metamorphosed Lower Cambrian to Middle Ordovician carbonate and clastic sedimentary rocks of the footwall/west side (Champlain Valley), during the Ordovician Taconian orogeny (e.g., Gillespie 1975; Dorsey et al., 1983; Stanley & Ratcliffe 1985; Stanley et al. 1987; Strehe & Stanley 1986; Kim et al. 2007, 2011). Other tectonic events to affect the field area include the Devonian Acadian orogeny and extension associated with Cretaceous magmatism (e.g., McHone 1978). Using simple line-balanced retro-deformation methods, Stanley et al. (1987), Stanley & Wright (1997) proposed that the Hinesburg thrust had a horizontal displacement of approximately 6 km.

The Pinnacle (CZp), Fairfield Pond (CZfp), and Cheshire (Cc) formations (Fig. 1) are the important lithologies in the hanging wall of the Hinesburg thrust. Both the Pinnacle and Fairfield Pond formations were deposited as clastic sediments in rift basins during Neoproterozoic rifting of the Rodinian supercontinent from approximately 590–554 Ma (e.g., Dorsey et al. 1983; Kumarpelli et al. 1989; Coish & Sinton 1992; Cherichetti et al. 1998; Walsh & Aleinikoff 1999). Continued rifting ultimately formed the Iapetus Ocean (e.g., van Staal et al. 1998) between the subcontinents of Laurentia and Gondwana. The Cheshire formation, which forms the base of the overlying passive continental margin sequence, was deposited upon the Fairfield Pond formation after the rift to drift transition. Because of structural repetition, the Cheshire formation is found both in the hanging wall and footwall of the Hinesburg thrust. Brief descriptions of the lithologic units and their general structural context in the hanging wall and field area are presented in Fig. 1.

The footwall of the Hinesburg thrust is dominantly comprised of carbonate and clastic sedimentary rocks, with the fault-bounded phyllites of the Skeels Corners formation being the exception. These rocks were deposited on the passive Laurentian continental margin as spreading in the Iapetus Ocean continued from the early Cambrian into the Middle Ordovician. The stratigraphy of these slices has been discussed in detail by Cady (1945), Welby (1961), Fisher (1968), Dorsey et al. (1983), Mehrtens & Dorsey (1987), Mehrtens & Hadley (1995), Mehrtens (1997), Mehrtens & Borre (1989), and Landing et al. (2003). The carbonate rocks of the Shelburne, Cutting, and Bascom formations (from oldest to youngest) are considered part of the Beekmantown Group whereas the older formations (oldest to youngest) Cheshire (quartzite), Dunham (dolostone), Monkton (quartzite), Winooski (dolostone), Danby (dolomitic sandstone), and Clarendon Springs (dolostone) are generally correlative with older members of the Potter Sandstone and Altona Formation of New York State (e.g., Fisher 1968; Landing et al. 2009).

STRUCTURAL GEOLOGY

Structures in the field area can be divided into three general age groupings (D0 = deformation event sequence), which include Ordovician (Taconian = D1, D2), Devonian (Acadian = D3, D4), and Cretaceous (D5) events. Bedding in sedimentary rocks of the footwall is considered to be S0. The relative structural chronology was determined through superposition and cross-cutting relationships. To display the structural complexity as simply as possible, a generalized three-dimensional diagram was constructed (Fig. 2) accompanied by Table 1, that describes the detailed
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structures, their ages, and applicable references. Figure 2 provides a unifying framework for this section and the later hydrogeology and groundwater geochemistry sections.

The Hinesburg thrust is particularly well exposed at an extensive outcrop in the field area (at Mechanicsville) (see Fig. 1 for location) where overturned phyllitic quartzites of the Cheshire formation (hanging wall) structurally overlie dolostone slivers of the Bascom formation (footwall) (Fig. 3A). At this location, it is a ductile shear zone that is marked in the hanging wall by $D_1$ mylonites, ultramylo-

nites, and phyllonites within a meter of the thrust contact (Fig. 3B). Rootless and reclined $D_1$ isoclinal folds are also prevalent that have stretching lineations collinear with their axes and the W-NW transport direction of the thrust (Fig. 3B); these folds are generally considered to be sheath folds. There are multiple generations of quartz veins in this fault zone, most of which are pre-syn $D_1$ (Strehle & Stanley 1986; Kim et al. 2011). As summarized by Passchier & Trouw (2005), mylonites are foliated and linedate rocks that were dominantly deformed by ductile flow; the grain size of these rocks was reduced from the protolith by recrystallization and intracrystalline deformation. The protolith of the Mechanicsville mylonites, based on comparisons with less deformed rocks of the Cheshire formation, was a shaly quartzite. The recrystallized mylonitic rocks contain primarily quartz and sericite, and the phyllonites are essentially mica-rich mylonites. Based on the intensity of fault-related fabrics in the hanging wall, Strehle & Stanley (1986) approximated the thickness of the thrust zone at 10–15 m. The dolostone in the footwall has multiple generations of quartz veins (Fig. 3D) and was deformed by the processes of fracturing, recrystallization, and pressure solution (Strehle & Stanley 1986) (Fig. 3D).

East of the Hinesburg thrust front, the $D_1$ foliation in the muscovite-biotite grade metamorphic rocks of the hanging wall, is a spaced cleavage in phyllitic quartzites that is characterized by alternating, parallel to anastomo-

sing, quartz/feldspar and mica domains. In phyllitic units, the $D_1$ continuous cleavage is defined by aligned zones of abundant sericite and chlorite.

© 2014 John Wiley & Sons Ltd, Geofluids, 14, 266–290
Table 1 Ductile and brittle structures that affected the hanging wall and footwall of the Hinesburg thrust in the field area with applicable references.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Orogeny</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Attitude planar if linear (general)</th>
<th>Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( D_5 )</td>
<td>Cretaceous (approximately 120 Ma)</td>
<td>Acadian</td>
<td>East-west trending fractures</td>
<td>Steep dips to north or south</td>
<td>Kim et al. (2007); Whitehead (2008); Gale et al. (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East-west trending en echelon fractures</td>
<td>Steep dips to north or south</td>
<td>Kim et al. (2011); Gale et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NW-trending fractures</td>
<td>Steep dips to east or west</td>
<td>Armstrong &amp; Stump (1971); McHone &amp; Cornelle (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lamprophyres</td>
<td>Intrusive all fracture sets and foliations above</td>
<td>Kim et al. (2007); Kim et al. (2011); Gale et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D_4 )</td>
<td>Devonian (approximately 390–380 Ma)</td>
<td>Acadian</td>
<td>( F_4 ) open-tight asymmetric folds-axial surface</td>
<td>East-west trending, steep dip north or south</td>
<td>Strehle &amp; Stanley (1986); Kim et al. (2011); West et al. (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( F_4 ) fold axis/crenulation lineation (L4)</td>
<td>Shallow-moderate plunge east or west</td>
<td>Dorsey et al. (1983); Kim et al. (2007); Gale et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( S_4 ) crenulation or disjunctive cleavage</td>
<td>East-west trending, steep dip north or south</td>
<td>Tauer (1982); DiPietro (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D_3 )</td>
<td>Devonian (approximately 390–380 Ma)</td>
<td>Acadian</td>
<td>( F_3 ) open-tight asymmetric folds-axial surface</td>
<td>NNE-trending steeply east-dipping</td>
<td>Strehle &amp; Stanley (1986); Kim et al. (2011); West et al. (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( F_3 ) fold axis/crenulation lineation (L3)</td>
<td>Shallow plunge north or south</td>
<td>Dorsey et al. (1983); Kim et al. (2007); Gale et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( S_3 ) crenulation or disjunctive cleavage</td>
<td>NNE-trending steeply east-dipping</td>
<td>Tauer (1982); DiPietro (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D_2 )</td>
<td>Ordovician (approximately 460–450 Ma)</td>
<td>Taconian</td>
<td>( F_2 ) symmetric shear bands</td>
<td>NNE-striking, east-dipping</td>
<td>Strehle &amp; Stanley (1986); Kim et al. (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( L_2 ) intersection lineation (( S_1 ) on ( S_2 ))</td>
<td>Down-dip plunge to east</td>
<td>Gillespie (1979); Strehle &amp; Stanley (1986); Thompson et al. (2004); Kim et al. (2011); West et al. (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D_1 )</td>
<td>Ordovician (approximately 460–450 Ma)</td>
<td>Taconian</td>
<td>Hinesburg thrust and mylonites</td>
<td>NNE-striking, east-dipping</td>
<td>Gale et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( F_1 ) reclined isoclinal folds-axial surface</td>
<td>NNE-striking, east-dipping</td>
<td>Gale et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) spaced foliation</td>
<td>NNE-striking, east-dipping</td>
<td>Gale et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( F_1 ) reclined isoclinal folds – fold axis/stretching lineation (L1)</td>
<td>Down-dip plunge to east</td>
<td>Tauer (1982); DiPietro (1983)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The \( D_2 \) top-to-the-west asymmetric shear bands reported by Strehle & Stanley (1986) and Kim et al. (2007, 2011) are ductile structures that locally developed near the Hinesburg thrust and in other discrete zones in the hanging wall. They are approximately parallel to the \( D_1 \) foliation in the surrounding rocks (and to the thrust) and, according to Strehle & Stanley (1986), represent thrust reactivation. In zones of \( D_2 \) development that are far from the surface expression of the Hinesburg thrust, the \( D_2 \) cleavage is defined by mica-rich zones in phyllites or alternating quartz and mica domains in phyllitic quartzites, that truncate the \( D_1 \) foliation. Pressure solution and dislocation creep in quartz were the mechanisms of deformation during \( D_2 \) development (Strehle & Stanley 1986).

In the exposed parts of the footwall of the Hinesburg thrust, west of the thrust front, bedding is the dominant planar structure in sedimentary rocks. In addition, \( D_1 \) bedding-parallel thrusts were occasionally observed, some with slivers of adjacent lithologies. Reclined and rootless \( D_1 \) isoclinal folds of dolomitic layers were observed in black phyllites (OCsk) of the footwall. In the hanging wall, bedding was transposed into parallelism with the \( D_1 \) foliation, so it is not discussed separately.

Throughout the field area, both the hanging and footwalls of the Hinesburg thrust were deformed by orthogonal \( D_3 \) (north-striking) and \( D_4 \) (east-striking) folds, with steeply dipping axial surfaces, which superpose to form a map-scale (1:24 000) Ramsey (1967) Type-1 dome and basin interference pattern (Derman et al. 2008; Earle et al. 2010; Kim et al. 2011). As the metamorphic rocks in the hanging wall vary compositionally from phyllites to phyllitic quartzites (Fairfield Pond and Cheshire Formations), open-tight asymmetric folding of these units preferentially formed crenulation cleavage in the former and disjunctive fracture cleavage in the latter. In the Town of Williston, which is in the northern half of the field area (see Fig. 1), rose diagrams and equal area nets (Fig. 4) show that both the \( D_3 \) and \( D_4 \) cleavages are steeply dipping and dominantly strike north–south (11°, 180°) and east–west (100°, 281°) (not considering standard deviations), respectively. The rose diagrams presented on this figure account for dip, using the right-hand rule.

At the map scale, the \( D_3 \) cleavage planes described above are parallel to the topographic lineaments that are formed by north–south trending, steep-sided, and narrow valleys on the LIDAR-based slope map of Fig. 5 (see Fig. 1A for
Based on field correlation, these lineaments occur on $D_3$ fold limbs in the hanging wall and are genetically related to the axial planar $D_3$ cleavage. Detailed $D_5$ fracture analysis was completed in the hanging and footwalls of the Hinesburg thrust (Fig. 6) (Kim et al. 2007, 2011) in Williston (see Fig. 1A for location). The contoured equal area nets show that all fracture sets are steeply dipping. The dominant fracture azimuths for both hanging wall and footwall are (not considering standard deviations) east–west ($84^\circ$, $290^\circ$) and north–northwest–south–southwest ($22^\circ$, $232^\circ$) (Fig. 6A). East–west azimuths ($92^\circ$, $283^\circ$) are dominant in the hanging wall.
Fig. 6B), whereas northeast-southwest azimuths (38°, 236°) are more pervasive in the footwall (Fig. 6C). Some of the east-west fracture sets have en echelon geometry. At the Mechanicsville site, both east-west and north-northeast to south-southwest trending fracture sets clearly cut through the hanging wall mylonites to the fault plane (Fig. 7).

Well-log data

Whereas bedrock mapping and structural analysis accurately portray the surface expression of the Hinesburg thrust, the analysis of lithologic logs for bedrock groundwater wells constrains the third dimension. A domestic well-log database at the Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation (VDEC) was searched for logs that indicate an abrupt transition from phyllites and phyllitic quartzites of the hanging wall to carbonates and/or black phyllites characteristic of the footwall. The locations of these wells were correlated either with accurate street addresses (e911 emergency responder system) or with Global Positioning System (GPS) locations. In addition, two wells were logged in the field by the first author.

The 22 well logs show the Hinesburg thrust that was penetrated at depths that ranged from 65 to 300 m (Table S1). Figure 8A shows the location of nine wells on a geologic map that were drilled through the Hinesburg thrust, with eight of them projected onto cross-section A-A’ (Fig. 8B). These thrust wells, along with wells that did not penetrate the Hinesburg thrust, were used to construct cross-section A-A’ which shows that the thrust was deformed by D3, large amplitude, asymmetric folds with approximately north-south striking and steeply east-dipping axial surfaces (e.g., Kim et al. 2007, 2011; Derman et al. 2008). In addition to the cross-sections, kilometer-scale folds can be seen on the LIDAR-based slope map (darkest shades represent the steepest slopes and vice versa) that underlies the bedrock geologic map of Fig. 8A; these folds were documented in the field by Kim et al. (2007) and Derman et al. (2008). Cross-section B-B’ also used water well logs to constrain the thrust depth (Fig. 8C) (see Fig. 1A for location).

Well logs from two closely spaced wells on Fig. 8A illustrate how the D3 folds deform the Hinesburg thrust (wells W40465 and W38073). A detailed lithologic log, based on well cuttings, was constructed for well W40465 (Fig. 8A, B), where the Hinesburg thrust was encountered near the crest of a fold at a depth of 145 m. During the drilling of this well, the markedly slower penetration rate in an approximately 10-m-thick zone above the abrupt change to sedimentary rocks was attributed to the mylonite zone shown in Fig. 3B. Below the thrust, shaly limestones were encountered followed by black shales, with the only water-producing interval at this contact. On the far eastern limb of the same fold, well W38073 (Fig. 8A, B) showed the thrust at 290 m, at an abrupt transition from phyllites to carbonates; this interpretation was based on a geophysical log (gamma, not shown).
HYDROGEOLOGY

The physical hydrogeology of the area surrounding the thrust fault was synthesized from the previously cited Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation well-log database (depths, yields, and static water levels). Yields were determined from well driller yield tests that use compressed air from the drill rig to push groundwater from the well to the surface so that an approximate flow rate/yield can be measured (e.g., Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection [http://www.mass.gov/eea/docs/dep/water/drinking/alpha/i-thru-z/wellyld.pdf]). For public water supply wells in Vermont, direct comparisons between well driller’s yield tests and formal pumping tests by the Drinking Water and Groundwater Protection Division at the Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation showed that, on average, the driller’s yield tests tend to overestimate the actual yield by a factor of two (R. Pingree, personal communication, 2013). In contrast, well driller yield tests have been used in other studies of fractured bedrock aquifers (e.g., DeSimone & Barbaro 2012), where they have been found to produce results similar to those of long-term pumping tests and do not contribute systematic bias. For simplicity, we used the well driller yield values at face value.

Using static water level and elevation data for bedrock wells throughout most of the field area, Filoon (2012) constructed reconnaissance-level piezometric contours for groundwater in the bedrock aquifer at a 50 m contour interval. Using these contours, generalized flow directions for the bedrock aquifer are shown in Fig. 9. The Lake Iroquois valley is a topographic low on the hanging wall that
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roughly divides it into two parts. Based on the surface water flow directions shown in Fig. 9, this valley drains southward for most of its length and then turns southwestward and crosses onto the footwall. North of Lake Iroquois, there is a drainage divide where surface water flow changes from southward to northward. In the eastern part of the hanging wall, groundwater flow in the bedrock aquifer is dominantly to the west. In the western part of the hanging wall, flow is radially away from topographic highs and/or westward toward the footwall. Near the surface trace of the Hinesburg thrust, groundwater flow is consistently westward. In the footwall aquifer, groundwater flow directions are generally radially or laterally away from local topographic highs, which are comprised of more erosion-resistant bedrock, and toward topographic lows, like Shelburne Pond.

Well logs for 79 bedrock wells, including the wells sampled in this study (n = 51), were used to constrain cross-sections (Table S1). When the completion depths of wells drilled through the Hinesburg thrust are compared with the depths to the thrust, it is apparent that most of these wells were completed a significant depth below the thrust surface; therefore, all of the well data were grouped according to the units in which they were completed, as Type I footwall wells (n = 22), Type II hanging wall wells (n = 34), and Type III wells drilled through the Hinesburg (n = 21). Type III wells were further subdivided into wells completed <30 m below the fault (n = 5) (Type IIIA) and wells drilled through thrust to footwall wells and completed >30 m below the fault (n = 16) (Type IIIB) (Fig. 10A).

The well yield and well depth statistics for each group described above are shown through box and whisker plots in Fig. 10B,C. The box limits represent the median 50% of data values (2nd and 3rd quartiles), whereas the lines depict the maximum data range. Yields for wells completed in the three main lithotectonic zones footwall (Type I), hanging wall (Type II), and thrust (Type III) are also numerically presented on cross-section A-A′ (Fig. 8B). The highest median well depth range is associated with hanging wall (Type II) (108–305 m) and thrust wells (IIIA = 114–291 m, IIIB = 166–351 m, IIIA + IIIB = 144–339 m), whereas that of footwall wells (73–141 m) is considerably less (Fig. 10B). The median yield range for Type I footwall wells (5–102 lpm) and Type IIIB thrust wells (11–95 lpm) is very similar, in both cases, producing mainly from fractured sedimentary rocks of the footwall. Bedrock wells completed in the metamorphic rocks of the hanging wall of the Hinesburg thrust have very low median yield ranges (1–9 lpm), compared with those completed in any other lithotectonic zone. For wells drilled through the Hinesburg thrust, Type IIIA wells (87–237 lpm) have a considerably higher median yield range than Type IIIB wells (11–95 lpm). Type IIIB wells were completed <30 m below the Hinesburg thrust.

Static water levels are only available for seven of the 22 wells in the field area that penetrated the Hinesburg thrust (Table S1). Although these measurements do not necessarily represent an equilibrium piezometric surface, they show water levels that rose tens of meters above the thrust level in the borehole directly after the well was completed. However, taken in context, Filoon (2012) found that the static levels of hanging wall wells are greater than the static levels of thrust wells by an average of 20 m, suggesting a general downward hydraulic gradient.

Filoon (2012) obtained reconnaissance CFC-11, CFC -12, and CFC -113 apparent recharge ages on groundwater from nine bedrock wells in the field area (Table 2). The apparent ages of groundwater in thrust wells (approximately 40 years) compared with hanging wall and footwall wells (approximately 30 years) are similar enough to indicate that groundwater is predominantly modern in the footwall, hanging wall, and thrust zone. For CFC methods, statistics, and the full dataset, refer to Filoon (2012).
AQUEOUS AND BEDROCK GEOCHEMISTRY

The source of the elevated radioactivity was evaluated by testing groundwater from bedrock wells and by analyzing compositions of bedrock from local outcrops. Fifty-one groundwater samples were collected from wells of Types I through III, sampling details are provided in the data repository (Table S2). Groundwater samples were analyzed for gross alpha radiation and U at the Vermont Department of Health and Laboratory in Burlington, Vermont. Concentrations of metals and anions were analyzed at the Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation Laboratory in Waterbury, Vermont. Details of analytical methods and precision are presented in the Supporting Information (Table S3). Seventy-three bedrock samples from the formations that comprise the regional aquifer were collected from outcrops and analyzed for whole-rock geochemistry by a combination of inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS) and ICP-atomic emission spectrometry (ICP-AES) following fusion with LiBO₂. Details of sample preparation and analytical precision are presented in the Supporting Information (Table S4). We will now present major element, radionuclide, and trace element groundwater geochemical data for the different lithotectonic groups. A summary of the groundwater geochemical data is shown in Table 3, and all of these data are in Table S5. These data are derived from North (2005), Davis (2008), and Bean (2009).

Piper diagrams

Groundwater from Type I wells in the footwall west of the thrust front has a strong Ca-Mg-HCO₃ signature, whereas Type II (hanging wall) groundwater spans a compositional spectrum intermediate between Na⁺K-Cl and Ca-Mg-HCO₃ end members (Fig. 11). Notably, groundwater in the footwall below the thrust fault (Types IIIA and IIIB wells) plots similar to Type II wells.
Radionuclides

Gross alpha radiation, which is the total alpha radiation emitted by radiogenic species in groundwater such as uranium and radium, is commonly used as a screening test for determining health risk and recommending further testing. In Vermont, one of the common screening limits is 15 picocuries liter⁻¹ (pCi l⁻¹), beyond which further testing for ²²⁶radium, ²²⁸radium, and uranium is recommended. We determined gross alpha and uranium results for groundwater from all sampled bedrock wells and then collated these data by lithotectonic unit in Table 4 to look for trends.

Mean gross alpha levels for wells that were completed either in the hanging wall of the Hinesburg thrust or drilled through the thrust into the footwall are approximately three times greater than the levels from wells drilled into the footwall west of the thrust front. As a whole, 50% of Type III wells have elevated gross alpha, and the same percentages hold for Type IIIB and Type IIIA wells, when considered separately. There are also notable differences in Type II wells based on well lithology, for example, 67% (6 of 9) wells in the Pinnacle formation exceed 15 pCi l⁻¹.
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and the average gross alpha concentration is 33 pCi l⁻¹. By comparison, only 7% (1 of 14) of Type II wells in the stratigraphically higher (younger) Fairfield Pond formation exceed 15 pCi l⁻¹, and average gross alpha concentration is only 8.7 pCi l⁻¹. None of the three wells in surficial deposits exceed 2 pCi l⁻¹.

Uranium concentrations generally follow gross alpha radiation trends with respect to structural unit: 16% of Type II wells (4/25) exceed the Vermont maximum contaminant level of 20 µg l⁻¹ and 25% (1/4) of Type IIIB (well completed >30 m below the thrust) wells exceed 20 µg l⁻¹, while no Type IIIA (0/2) or Type I (footwall) wells (0/20) exceed 20 µg l⁻¹. Average U concentration in hanging wall groundwater is 17.2 µg l⁻¹, and with alpha radiation, this elevated signature is dominated by groundwater produced from the Pinnacle formation, where 33% of wells exceed 20 µg l⁻¹, average U is 30.9 µg l⁻¹, and the maximum value is 143 µg l⁻¹.

Gross alpha and uranium levels for all lithotectonic well categories are shown in Fig. 13A,B. It is notable that all elevated gross alpha (>15 pCi l⁻¹) and uranium (>20 µg l⁻¹) occur either in wells completed in the hanging wall (Type II) or drilled through the Hinesburg thrust (Types IIIA and IIIB) (Fig. 12A,B). If the thrust well types are examined separately, Type IIIA (n = 2) and IIIB (n = 4) wells have one elevated gross alpha and zero elevated uranium occurrences, and two elevated gross alpha occurrences and one elevated uranium occurrence, respectively. For wells competed in the hanging wall or drilled through the thrust, the elevated gross alpha incidences (10) are double that of elevated uranium, which indicates a source of alpha radiation other than that derived from the radioactive decay of uranium. By testing six hanging wall and thrust wells for ²²⁶Ra and ²²³Ra (Table S5), ²²³Ra was determined to the missing isotope; ²²³Ra is not an alpha particle emitter.

In the absence of radium tests, residual gross alpha (RGA) provides a means of generally expressing the quantity of alpha radiation that is not produced by uranium decay. It is calculated according to the equation (EPA 2000):

\[ x_{\text{residual}} = \text{gross alpha} - \frac{0.67 \times [\text{U}]}{1} \]

RGA can be used as a proxy for the abundance of ²²³Ra. In addition, the ratio of residual gross alpha to total gross alpha gives an approximation of the ratio of radium-derived alpha radiation to total alpha radiation. RGA levels and RGA/TGA ratios were calculated for all lithotectonic well categories (Fig. 12C and Table S5). The fact that 39% of all hanging wall and thrust wells have RGA/TGA ratios >0.50 indicates that radium may comprise a significant portion of the gross alpha total.

**Multielement plots**

To discriminate further between groundwater from Type I versus II versus III wells, gross alpha, Na, Mg, Ba, Sr, and alkalinity were chosen as parameters because together they provide compositional fingerprints of hanging wall versus footwall groundwater (Fig. 13). Figure 13A,B is box and whisker spider plots for footwall (Type I) and hanging wall (Type II) wells, respectively, using these parameters. To have all these parameters display within the same range on these plots, Ba, Sr, and alkalinity were divided by the same constants for the two well types. Whereas the footwall wells have higher median Mg and alkalinity, the hanging wall wells have higher median gross alpha, Na, Ba, and Sr. Using Fig. 13A,B as references, we will now evaluate the groundwater composition of thrust wells.

Figure 14A shows the six Type III wells that were sampled for groundwater chemistry in this study. The wells are arranged from west to east based on the distance each well is located from the Hinesburg thrust front and labeled whether it is considered Type IIIA (completed <30 m below the thrust) or Type IIIB (completed >30 m below the thrust); lithologies are also shown. Spider plots for these thrust wells were constructed using the same parameters as above and are directly compared with Fig. 13A,B by using dashed lines for footwall wells (Type I) and solid
Table 3 Composition of groundwater in bedrock wells producing from the footwall (Type I), hanging wall (Type II), and wells drilled through the Hinesburg thrust (Type III). The right-hand column indicates predominant control on composition of groundwater in Type III wells, where ‘HW’ = hanging wall signature, ‘FW’ = footwall signature, and ‘Mixing’ = influence of both HW and FW. ‘Depth’ indicates parameters whose values are largely controlled by the depth of Type III wells. ‘Anthro’ = likely anthropogenic influence. ‘HW’ and ‘Mixing’ signatures are evidence for flow of groundwater through fractures that cross-cut the thrust.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Footwall (Type I, dominantly carbonates)</th>
<th>Hanging wall (Type II, dominantly siliciclastic)</th>
<th>Thrust wells (Type III)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 20</td>
<td>N = 25</td>
<td>N = 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>pCi l⁻¹</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>ppb</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp</td>
<td>°C</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cond</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORP</td>
<td>mV</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>ppm</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>ppm</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl⁻</td>
<td>ppm</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>ppm</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiO₂</td>
<td>ppm</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>ppm</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl⁻</td>
<td>ppm</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO₃⁻</td>
<td>ppm</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>ppm</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₄²⁻</td>
<td>ppm</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn</td>
<td>ppm</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>ppm</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>ppb</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 11. Piper Plots of groundwater from each well type (Piper 1944).

Lithotectonic Groundwater Groups
- Surficial Wells (S) (N = 3)
- Type I (Footwall) Wells (N = 20)
- Type II (Hanging Wall) Wells (N = 25)
- Type III-A (Thrust) Wells (N = 2)
- Type III-B (Thrust) Wells (N = 4)

Whole-rock geochemistry

Box and whisker plots were also used to display the whole-rock geochemistry of lithologies in the hanging wall and footwall. Although Na, Mg, Ba, and Sr were also used to characterize whole-rock geochemistry signatures, U+Th and Ca were, respectively, substituted for the gross alpha and alkalinity parameters used with groundwater. Whole-rock geochemistry signatures have been used with groundwater. Whole-rock geochemistry signatures have been used with groundwater. Whole-rock geochemistry signatures have been used with groundwater.
rock chemical compositions of metamorphosed clastic-dominated hanging wall rocks are elevated in U, Th, Na, and Ba relative to footwall rocks, and higher Ca and Mg abundances are found in the carbonate-dominated footwall rocks (Table 5; Fig. 15). Whereas Table 5 is only a summary of the whole-rock data, the full dataset can be found in Table S6. These data are derived from North (2005), Davis (2008), and Bean (2009). With the exception of Sr, these signatures are very similar to those seen in the groundwater compositions of Fig. 13.

**DISCUSSION**

The architecture and permeability structure of upper crustal brittle fault zones are considerably different than that of ductile fault zones. For example, Chester & Logan (1986),
Bruhn et al. (1994), Caine et al. (1996, 2010), Gudmundsson (2011) and Bense et al. (2013) indicate that brittle upper crustal fault zones consist of three parts, which are (i) the fault core, the internal portions adjacent to the slip surface along which the highest strain and displacement occurred; (ii) the damage zone, the portions external to the fault core where the residual strain eventually diminishes moving outward; and (iii) the protolith, the unstrained rock on either side of the fault. In this type of fault scenario, fractures and minor faults are common in the damage zone whereas breccias and cataclastic rock dominantly comprise the fault core. Consequently, damage zones are generally conduits for groundwater flow, whereas the fault core tends to be a barrier.

In contrast, Caine et al. (2010) summarize the following points regarding the architecture and permeability structure of ductile fault zones: (i) They are frequently cored by highly strained mylonitic rocks that grade progressively outward on either side into less-strained rocks of the protolith; (ii) a damage zone sensu stricto is absent; (iii) the crystal plastic deformation associated with ductile shear zones maintains rock cohesion and inhibits the development of transmissive planar structures that are favorable for groundwater transport; and (iv) the mylonitic ‘core’ and protolith of a ductile fault zone may have similar permeabilities, unless the fault is active.

The Hinesburg thrust juxtaposes muscovite–biotite-grade metamorphic rocks (phyllic quartzites) of the hanging wall with dominantly carbonate sedimentary rocks of the footwall. Based on the presence of $D_1$ mylonites, reclined isoclinal folds with sheath fold geometry, well-developed stretching lineations aligned with the fault transport direction, and superposed $D_2$ asymmetric shear bands in hanging wall metamorphic rocks and extensively recrystallized carbonates with bedding-parallel thrusts in the footwall, the Hinesburg thrust unequivocally represents a ductile fault zone that was active during the Ordovician Taconian orogeny. Because the mylonites deformed by the process of ductile flow (crystal plastic deformation) (e.g., Passchier & Trouw 2005), which maintains rock cohesion and prevents the development of planar structures, we would not expect them to be very permeable to groundwater (Caine et al. 2010). After a brief discussion of fault-related veins and their potential effect on fault zone permeability, the post-Ordovician tectonic evolution of this thrust will be discussed in detail.

There are multiple generations of pre and syn $D_1$ veins in the hanging wall at the Mechanicsville site, which recorded transient periods of brittle deformation. However, the quartz grains within these veins have been strongly overprinted by the $D_1$ and $D_2$ ductile structures and have strong shape and lattice-preferred orientation. These highly strained veins would not be permeable to groundwater flow.

Quartz and quartz-carbonate veins and stylolites in dolostones in the footwall of the Hinesburg thrust at Mechanicsville occur at all angles to the thrust surface. Strehle & Stanley (1986) propose that these veins formed during or after $S_1$ as metamorphic fluids permeated the thrust. The heavy veining and recrystallized fabric of the dolostone also suggest that this footwall lithology is probably not permeable. The fault surface at Mechanicsville is not sufficiently exposed to evaluate the lateral extent of the veins in either the footwall or hanging wall.

Depending on the lithology (phyllite versus phyllic quartzite), the orthogonal $D_3$ and $D_4$ fold sets generated crenulation and disjunctive/fracture cleavages. At the outcrop scale, there is no visible secondary porosity associated with $D_4$ and/or $D_4$ crenulation cleavage. Although disjunctive cleavage planes locally looked like fractures, they were rarely open. There are also map-scale north–south trending topographic lineaments that are directly related to $D_3$ folding and its associated axial planar cleavage (Fig. 5), which presumably overprint the thrust surface. However, because these lineaments occur in sparsely populated rural areas, there is insufficient well coverage to evaluate their permeability structure. We do not consider $D_3$ and $D_4$
cleavages to be viable pathways for groundwater flow, unless they localized later fracturing.

Figures 4 and 6 show rose diagrams and contoured equal area nets for $D_3$ and $D_4$ cleavages and $D_5$ extension fractures, respectively. The $D_3$ cleavage strikes approximately north–south, whereas $D_4$ strikes east–west; both dip steeply. Within error, there are two $D_5$ fracture sets of the same attitudes. We believe that it is possible that the $D_3$ and $D_4$ cleavages may have localized the formation of these two $D_5$ fracture sets. The orientations of fractures that form in previously deformed rocks are greatly affected by the orientations of preexisting planes of weakness, such as an inherited foliation or an older joint set. These mechanical anisotropies influence the shear strength of a rock in different directions and, therefore, influence the geometry of any new fracture sets (e.g., Donath 1961; Twiss & Moores 2007). It is possible, however, that the $D_3$ and $D_4$ cleavages are unrelated to any $D_5$ fractures.

$D_5$ extension fractures were conduits for fluid flow (magmas) during the Cretaceous because all dominant fracture sets in the field area were locally intruded by lamprophyres of this age (135–115 Ma; McHone 1978, 1987). These alkali rocks are of continental rift-zone tectonic affinity and are mantle-derived, so they must have risen upward along preexisting planes of weakness in the hanging and foot walls of the Hinesburg thrust.

At the Mechanicsville site, both approximately N-S and E-W trending, approximately vertical fracture sets cut through the mylonites of the hanging wall of the Hinesburg thrust and abut the fault surface. Some of the N-S fractures have en echelon geometry. In terms of modern groundwater flow, it is important to note that bedrock springs emanate from some N-S and E-W fractures, making these fractures groundwater conduits through the mylonites.

In summary, based on the examination of Ordovician $D_1$ and $D_2$ ductile structures alone, it cannot be said with any certainty whether the permeability of the fault zone of the Hinesburg thrust is any greater than the hanging wall and footwall protoliths on either side. However, subse-
quent Devonian $D_3$ and $D_4$ events folded the thrust and produced cleavages that may have localized some $D_5$ Cretaceous extension fracture sets, which enhanced the hydraulic connection between hanging wall and footwall. It is also possible that the $D_3$ and $D_4$ cleavages are independent of the later fracture development.

Subsurface physical hydrogeology

The box and whisker plots on Fig. 10.C highlight the large difference in median yield between bedrock wells completed in metamorphic rocks of the hanging wall of the Hinesburg thrust (low) versus those completed in carbonate sedimentary rocks of the footwall (high). Whether a well is completed in the footwall west of the thrust front (Type I) or significantly below (>30 m) the thrust (Type IIIB), the median yields displayed by the boxes (2nd and 3rd quartiles) and low and high ranges are very similar (Fig. 10.C). Therefore, in terms of a simple model, the Hinesburg thrust merely emplaced low-permeability (low-K) metamorphic rocks on top of high-permeability (high-K) sedimentary rocks along a ductile fault zone (Fig. 16.A). Although based on a smaller dataset ($n = 5$ versus $n = 16$), the median yield block for Type IIIB wells, which were completed <30 m below the thrust, is significantly higher than either of those for Type I or Type IIIB wells. An increase in yield for a well completed near the fault zone would be expected in the above scenario as the fault zone would be a place where groundwater from the hanging wall would percolate downward to, through any permeable planar structure(s). Alternatively, the increased yields could be due to the development of secondary porosity in footwall carbonates along/near the fault zone.

In inactive ductile fault zones, Caine et al. (2010) suggest that fault zone lithologies may have similar permeabilities to their protoliths. Therefore, mylonites of the hanging wall should have a similar permeability to the lesser-strained metamorphic rocks of their protolith above, and the same could be said about the recrystallized and fractured carbonates of the footwall and their protolith below. The net result of this permeability equivalence would be a low-K hanging wall overlaying a high-K footwall, with little affect from the fault zone.

Subsurface chemical hydrogeology

The strong Ca-Mg-HCO$_3$ signature of Type I (footwall) wells is expected given the dominance of dolostone and limestone in the footwall. Groundwater from Type II (hanging wall) wells trends toward a Na+K-Cl signature because of weathering of mica and albite feldspar (e.g., Reimann & de Caritat 1998) in the metasedimentary rock aquifer of the hanging wall. The fact that some Type II hanging wall wells also have a significant Ca-Mg-HCO$_3$ component (Fig. 11) likely indicates dissolution of calcite-bearing veins and/or thin marble layers in metamorphosed hanging wall clastic rocks, both of which were observed in the Fairfield Pond and Pinnacle formations during field work by North (2005), Kim et al. (2007), Gale et al. (2012), and Kim et al. (2013). The similarity in major element compositions of hanging wall wells (Type II) and thrust wells (Type IIIA and IIIB) is notable because the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Footwall carbonates only (N = 21)</th>
<th>Hanging wall siliciclastics (N = 46)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiO$_2$</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TiO$_2$</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al$_2$O$_3$</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe$_2$O$_3$</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MnO</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgO</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaO</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na$_2$O</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K$_2$O</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P$_2$O$_5$</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pb</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zn</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bold and italic values indicate bedrock components that appear in groundwater compositions as evidence for mixing of HW (Type II well) groundwater and thrust (Type III well) groundwater (Table 3). DL = detection limit; SD = standard deviation. Complete data set is in Table S6.
dominant rock type in the footwall below the thrust is carbonate sedimentary rock. To the west of the thrust front (where there is no hanging wall influence), groundwater is Ca-Mg-HCO₃-rich, so the occurrence of Na⁺K-Cl groundwater in Type III wells suggests downward flow of hanging wall groundwater through the thrust and into the footwall below the thrust.

Five of six Type III thrust wells display a very similar hydrochemical pattern to groundwater from Type II wells. Of the two Type IIIA thrust wells sampled, well 80607-2 (Fig. 14B) has a hydrochemical signature that is most similar to Type I footwall groundwater as this well is located closest to the thrust front, suggesting infiltration from the footwall to the west of the thrust exposure; however, the high gross alpha in this well is evidence for some hanging wall influence. Although the higher Na and Sr levels in the other Type IIIA well (KPN101, Fig. 14F) combined with lower Mg and alkalinity levels indicate hanging wall contribution, the lower gross alpha and Ba may reflect some footwall influence. Accordingly, hydrochemical data are consistent with downward flow of groundwater from the hanging wall aquifer to that of the footwall, likely through fractures in the thrust zone (Fig. 7). To integrate the physical and chemical hydrogeology of thrust wells, Type IIIA wells that were completed >30 m below the thrust have a strong hanging wall signature and lower median yields, whereas Type IIIA wells completed closer to the thrust have a more mixed signature and higher median yields.

Box and whisker plots (Fig. 15) that were used to compare rock compositions from hanging wall and footwall show that groundwater chemistry (Fig. 13) with the exception of Sr correlates strongly with rock chemistry. The spider diagrams in Figs 13 and 15 show that rocks and groundwater from the hanging wall have higher median gross alpha, Na, and Ba and lower median Mg and alkalinity, whereas the opposite is true for the footwall. While we have no direct measurements of radioactivity in specific minerals, it is clear that the clastic rocks of the hanging wall are enriched in U and Th as well as Zr, Y, La, and Ce relative to footwall carbonates. For example, thin section photomicrographs of phyllitic quartzites in the Cheshire formation indicate that U-Th-bearing minerals such as zircon are found along D₃ (=S3) disjunctive cleavage planes (Fig. 17). Iron oxides and hydroxides are present along D₃ (=S3)
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and $D_3$ (=S1) cleavages, indicating that in situ weathering and oxidation occurred along these surfaces. These zircons may either have a metamorphic origin or alternatively, be detrital zircons that were fortuitously enveloped by this cleavage. Although trace minerals such as zircon are very resistant to breakdown in groundwater (Balan et al. 2001), internal radiation damage (metamictization) (Woodhead et al. 1991) and grain size reduction and dissolution in shear zones (Dempster et al. 2008) make zircon and other radionuclide-bearing minerals more susceptible to release of U, Th, and their decay products in groundwater.

3. Alpha recoil has been attributed to release of alpha particles and Ra into solution where parent radionuclide-bearing minerals, such as iron oxyhydroxides, occur along fracture surfaces in bedrock aquifers (Vinson et al. 2009; Speer et al., 1981). Also, given that iron oxides and hydroxides are capable of sorbing U (Scott et al. 2008), the presence of iron minerals would enhance the release of radionuclides into groundwater.
2005), the iron oxides and hydroxides occurring along the fracture planes may also be a source of U. Once released from the host mineral, U solubility is enhanced by abundant bicarbonate (Langmuir 1997) in both the footwall and hanging wall aquifers.

High Sr values in groundwater from Type II (hanging wall) and Type III (thrust) wells are likely related to Sr concentration in source minerals. Although bulk-rock Sr is lower in hanging wall rocks than footwall rocks (Table 5; Table S6), hanging wall Sr may be enriched by calcite veins and/or thin marble layers in hanging wall metamorphic rocks.

During diagenesis, Sr is released from calcite and dolomite during recrystallization, resulting in low Sr values in diagenetically altered carbonate rocks (typically <100 ppm; Banner 1995) (mean Sr for carbonate rocks in this study is 160 ppm). The Sr that is released from calcite and dolomite migrates into pore waters and is later incorporated into vein calcite, reaching concentrations ranging from 2000 to 40 000 ppm Sr (Powell 1965). Elburg and Bons (2005) found that calcite veins in carbonaceous shales were always enriched in Sr relative to the calcite in the shale host. Based on these studies, we suggest it is possible that the dissolution of calcite veins in the hanging wall could produce groundwater with high Sr relative to footwall groundwater. The migration of hanging wall groundwater across D₃ fractures through the thrust would also result in Type III groundwater with a similar Sr signal to Type II groundwater.

**Spatial analysis of geologic and hydrogeologic parameters**

The two cross-sections in Fig. 8 demonstrate some important limitations on yields for wells drilled through the Hinesburg thrust. Cross-section A-A’ shows that high well yields are found from the western limit of the thrust to the first large amplitude D₃ fold to the east. Cross-section B-B’ shows the same general trend. This high yield zone also coincides with the area of strongest topographic lineament development in Fig. 5 (also see Fig. 1). The highest yields for Type III wells on the western side of both cross-sections (89–378 lpm) can be due to eastward flow beneath the thrust from the productive footwall aquifer or from westward (and downward) flow from the hanging wall aquifer (Fig. 9), or both. The fact that well 80607-2 (Fig. 14A) is located right at the thrust front has a high yield (189 lpm), and footwall-dominant groundwater geochemistry supports the former. Other thrust wells that were tested in this study have lower yields (11–30 lpm) and, no matter how far they were completed below the thrust surface, have hanging wall-dominated groundwater geochemical signatures. The higher median yields for Type IIIA wells that were completed <30 m below the thrust could imply that the thrust zone is an area where groundwater mixes after leaking downward through the low-K hanging wall.

Moving eastward past the first D₃ fold on cross-section A-A’, the thickness of the hanging wall increases to >400 m and yields decrease to the 0–8 lpm range, even when a second D₃ fold is encountered. As the Hinesburg thrust deepens, the lithostatic load likely closes down any planar structures in the footwall and lower hanging wall that could transmit groundwater.

Figure 12 shows the distribution of radionuclide levels in groundwater throughout the field area. Looking at gross alpha alone, the highest levels in hanging wall (Type II) and thrust (Type III) wells generally occur in/around the Lake Iroquois valley and at/near the western edge of the Hinesburg thrust. The same can be said about U and...
RGA/TGA levels. Based on groundwater and surface water flow directions on Fig. 9, both of these areas could be characterized as discharge zones whereas the neighboring highlands are recharge zones. Ryan et al. (2013) found that the highest As levels in groundwater from a fractured metasedimentary rock aquifer in southwestern Vermont occurred in low lying discharge zones where groundwater flow paths and residence times in the bedrock aquifer had been the longest. We believe that this study may also apply to our elevated radionuclide occurrences in the hanging wall aquifer and in the footwall aquifer below the Hinesburg thrust, after downward infiltration of groundwater with a hanging wall geochemical signature.

**An integrated model**

Figure 16 shows a time series for the structural and hydrogeological development of the Hinesburg thrust. The ductile juxtaposition of low-K metamorphic rocks of the hanging wall of the Hinesburg thrust with high-K sedimentary rocks of the footwall created the basic architecture that would later influence the hydrogeology of the field area (Fig.16A). Although the mylonites that formed on the hanging wall side of this ductile fault zone could be considered a barrier to groundwater flow, it is more likely, however, that their permeability is no different than that of the metamorphic protolith (Caine et al. 2010), after fault motion had ceased. The poor exposure of these mylonites precludes a direct evaluation of their permeability structure. $D_3$ and $D_4$ folding events (Fig.16B) deformed the Hinesburg thrust into domes and basins and introduced orthogonal cleavage sets, which probably localized the formation of some $D_5$ fracture sets and subsequent lamprophyre intrusions (Fig.16C). As springs flow along some $D_5$ fracture sets that cut through the mylonites to the fault plane, it is reasonable to assume that these fractures enhanced the hydraulic connection between the hanging wall and footwall aquifers.

Figure 16D summarizes the present day hydrogeology of the Hinesburg thrust using a model of a low-K hanging wall overlying a high-K footwall that has been significantly modified by the development of permeable fracture sets that transect the fault zone. The following points support this model:

1. The median yields of wells completed in the footwall (Type I) far exceed those of the hanging wall (Type II).
2. The median yields of Type IIIA wells (completed <30 m from the thrust) exceed those of Type IIIB wells (completed >30 m from the thrust). This is consistent with the mixing of groundwater that would be expected to occur at/near the interface between the hanging wall and footwall, whether this reflects the permeability contrast between the low-K and high-K rock types alone, the enhanced hydraulic connection across the fault zone provided by fractures, or both. Type IIIB wells have median yields similar to those of Type I footwall wells.
3. The geochemistry of groundwater from most wells completed through Hinesburg thrust (Types IIIA and IIIB) has a strong hanging wall signature. Thrust wells completed near the toe of the thrust may have a footwall or mixed geochemical signature, reflecting the eastward flow of groundwater from the footwall aquifer. The analysis of static water levels in the hanging wall versus footwall indicates a downward gradient, which supports hanging wall-dominant geochemical signatures in thrust wells.

Although many authors (Evans & Chester 1995; Caine & Forster 1999; Fairly & Hinds 2004; Minor & Hudson 2006) note that fault zones exhibit considerable structural and hydrogeological variability along strike, we noticed some consistencies for the Hinesburg thrust. The high yield zone associated with wells drilled through the Hinesburg thrust only persists from the thrust front eastward to the first large amplitude $D_3$ fold (Fig.16D); this is possibly due to the fact that the rapid increase in thrust depth (and hanging wall thickness) and corresponding lithostatic pressure after this point closes down structures capable of transporting groundwater. This zone roughly correlates with that of well-developed $D_3$ topographic lineaments. In addition, the great thrust depths (>500 m) make the thrust more difficult for drill rigs to reach. Along strike thrust wells, with the exception of one well at the thrust front, have a hanging wall geochemical signature.

**Appalachian Analogues**

In detailed bedrock hydrogeological studies in the Blue Ridge province of Virginia, Seaton & Burbey (2000, 2005) found strongly fractured, highly permeable, and transmissive zones in the brittle crystalline metamorphic rocks above thrust faults. These high-yielding zones were not continuous, but were compartmentalized by local structural and metamorphic factors such as the distribution of quartz veins, which later fractured and provided groundwater breach zones that influenced the volume of recharge. Subordinate faults and lineaments provide conduits for recharge to the confined thrust aquifers. The structural settings of Hinesburg thrust and the Seaton & Burbey (2005) study are generally similar, where a hanging wall of Precambrian crystalline metamorphic rocks of the Blue Ridge was juxtaposed with a footwall comprised of Paleozoic sedimentary rocks of the foreland along a ductile fault zone. However, a fundamental difference is that the Blue Ridge study focused on thrust faults internal to the thick (>1200 m) stack of crystalline slices that tectonically overlie the sedimentary rocks, which were not accessible because of their depth. At present, we do not have evidence for highly fractured and transmissive zones above...
thrust faults that are internal to the hanging wall of the Hinesburg thrust. To make the scales of the two studies equivalent, we would also have to include the metamorphic rocks of the hanging wall of the Lake Iroquois Thrust (Figs 1 and 8) on the eastern side of the field area in our study.

CONCLUSIONS

The Hinesburg thrust underwent a protracted and multi-stage tectonic evolution in which it formed at depth as a ductile fault ($D_1$) mylonites and associated folding) and moved a second time after ‘locking up’ ($D_2$ asymmetric shear bands) during the Ordovician. It was then deformed twice ($D_3$ and $D_4$) during the Devonian Acadian orogeny by orthogonal map-scale folds with axial planar disjunctive and crenulation cleavages, and lastly was extensively fractured ($D_5$) and intruded by lamprophyre magmas during the Cretaceous. Some $D_5$ fracture sets (approximately north-south and approximately east-west striking) were likely localized by the previously existing $D_3$ and $D_4$ cleavages.

From well yield analysis, it is clear that the hanging wall aquifer (Type II wells) is not productive and the footwall aquifer is (Type I wells). We divided wells completed below the Hinesburg thrust into categories depending on whether they were completed <30 m below (Type IIIA) and >30 m below (Type IIIB). Type IIIA wells have the highest median yields of all wells, and Type IIIB wells have median yields in the same range as Type I wells.

The groundwater geochemical signature of the hanging wall and footwall aquifers, with the exception of Sr, correlates strongly with the whole-rock geochemistry of the lithologies in each. The hanging wall aquifer is relatively enriched in alpha radiation (and, uranium), Na+K-Cl, Ba, and Sr, whereas the footwall aquifer is enriched in Ca-Mg-HCO$_3$ and alkalinity. Both Type IIIA and IIIB wells that penetrated the Hinesburg thrust and were completed in the footwall generally have geochemical signatures trending toward hanging wall compositions, reflecting downward infiltration. However, one Type IIIA well near the thrust front has a footwall-dominated groundwater geochemical signature.

A relatively simple model to integrate the hydrogeology and structural geology of the Hinesburg thrust was constructed, which involves the emplacement of low-K metamorphic rocks of the hanging wall onto high-K sedimentary rocks of the footwall. The fault zone interface of mylonites on the hanging wall side and recrystallized and imbricated carbonates on the footwall side probably have the same permeabilities as their respective protoliths. This structural framework allows for the strong contrast in well yields and the downward infiltration of hanging wall-derived groundwater that mixes in a zone just below the Hinesburg thrust. The downward permeability of the hanging wall and thrust zone was likely enhanced by $D_5$ fracture development, which may have been localized by previous episodes of cleavage development.

EPILOG: PUBLIC HEALTH APPLICATIONS

During the winter of 2007, the Vermont Geological Survey (VGS) and collaborators from Middlebury College presented a progress report to the Select Board from the Town of Hinesburg. This report included maps and emphasized that elevated radionuclide levels were much more common in bedrock wells completed in the hanging wall than in the footwall. During the spring of 2008, the VGS summarized the results of recent bedrock and surficial mapping and geochemical well testing to the Planning Commission for the Town of Williston. The Vermont Department of Health was frequently advised of elevated radionuclide tests and their geologic context through oral presentations. Based on this work and recommendations by the Vermont Department of Health, many well drillers in Vermont now regularly advise their clients to test for radionuclides. Future testing of groundwater for radionuclides is planned in 2014 south of the current field area in the Bristol and South Mountain quadrangles, where the bedrock framework is nearly identical.
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**SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article:

- **Table S1** Well-log data.
- **Table S2** Water sampling details.
- **Table S3** Analytical methods and precision for groundwater geochemistry.
- **Table S4** Analytical methods and precision for whole-rock geochemistry.
- **Table S5** Complete groundwater geochemical dataset.
- **Table S6** Complete whole-rock geochemical dataset.
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