cmic-footprints.ca



# Exploration footprint of the McArthur River and Millennium unconformity uranium deposits: Highlights and challenges

Kevin Ansdell, University of Saskatchewan Kurt Kyser, Queen's University Ken Wasyliuk, University of Saskatchewan and the NSERC-CMIC Mineral Exploration Research Network







### **Location of Footprint Sites**



U site – 2 deposits:



## **Background Geology**





#### Relatively mature exploration with "accepted" model MFa, MFb, MFc, MFd



*modified after Jefferson et al (2007)* Ansdell – SEG 2018 Keystone – Footprints U Site



### **Geology- Alteration Model**



RSNG

#### Dominated by Qz, and so alteration is subtle

Linked with "structures" "fractures" extend to surface?

Alteration = Geochemical variations = how to image using geophysics

Average non-Quartz Mineral Proportions<sup>Illite 1.91 ± 2.47 %</sup>

± 1.81 %



### **Exploration Knowledge**



Many techniques utilized over many years – can a statistically recognizable pattern of integrated data sets be developed?



Legacy data – drilling since the mid-1980's – whole rock geochemical data ->10,000 samples - rock, mineralogy, structure

New data – 230 samples, McArthur River area

CRSNG

from Jefferson et al (2007)

canadamining innovationcouncil

Ansdell – SEG 2018 Keystone – Footprints U Site



**Outline of Highlights Geochemistry in** sandstone Pathfinders and minerals **Fractures Surficial mapping Geophysics:** 

Seismic footprint Consistent Common Earth Model?

canadamining

novationcouncil

**Overburden stripping** 

modified after Cameco SEG Short Course (2015)





-0m



#### **U Site Research Team**

 $\odot$ 

- Site Leaders and Research Associates
  - Kevin Ansdell, Saskatchewan
  - Kurt Kyser, Queen's
  - Ken Wasyliuk, Saskatchewan
  - Mohamed Gouiza, Saskatchewan
- PhD students
  - Mehrdad Darijani, Memorial
  - Dong Shi, Toronto
- MSc students
  - Mary Devine, Ottawa
  - Shannon Guffey, Memorial
  - Nick Joyce, Queen's
  - Shawn Scott, Waterloo
  - Marissa Valentino, Queen's
- BSc students

• Yaozhu Li, Waterloo canadamining innovationcouncil

- Researchers and collaborators
  - Martina Bertelli, Western
  - Steve Beyer, Queen's
  - Michel Chouteau, Poly. Montréal
  - Najib El Goumi, GSC
  - Randy Enkin, GSC
  - Colin Farquharson, Memorial
  - Leonardo Feltrin, Western
  - Keiko Hattori, Ottawa
  - Julia King, Consultant
  - Dan Layton-Matthews, Queen's
  - Matt Leybourne, Queen's
  - John McGaughey, Mira
  - Bernd Milkereit, Toronto
  - Reza Mir, Laurentian
  - William Morris, McMaster
  - Steve Piercey, Memorial
  - Benoit Rivard, Alberta



- Martin Ross, Waterloo
- Pejman Shamsipour, Poly. Mtl.
- Richard Smith, Laurentian
- Marc Vallée, Memorial
- Subject matter experts
  - Tom Kotzer, Cameco
  - Clare O'Dowd, Cameco
  - Garnet Wood, Cameco
  - Gerard Zaluski, Cameco
  - Dave Quirt, Orano
  - Rob Hearst, Orano
  - Patrick Ledru, Orano
  - Dale Verran, Denison Mines
  - Larry Petrie, Denison Mines
- And numerous others!!



#### Geology Model Development NSERC-CMIC SCOTPRINTS

Ansdell – SEG 2018 Keystone – Footprints U Site



Gouiza 2014 GAC-MAC

canadamining

novationcounci

Drilling along conductors (structures) constrains the distribution of drill holes and concentration of data (1440 holes provided by Cameco)

70 large scale (6 to 20 km long) cross-sectionsstratigraphy

> 123 small scale (50 to 200m long) + cross-sections structure



Positive correlation between fracture intensity and uranium concentration



Ansdell - SEG 2018 Keystone - Footprints U Site

Gouiza 2014 GAC-MAC

#### **Millennium Geochemistry**



#### Gradual increase in Mg/Al with respect to deposit location.



Ansdell – SEG 2018 Keystone – Footprints U Site

Guffey 2017 MSc Memorial U. Guffey 2018 GEEA in press



#### Millennium Plan view

Mg/K (mol) variations observed >10km along structure

"Chimneys" of certain elements (e.g. Mo) above deposit

Guffey 2017 MSc Memorial U. Guffey 2018 GEEA in press



#### **Millennium Geochemistry**

MFd]					
MFc		$\begin{array}{c} \hline \\ \hline $			
MFb					
MFa					
	kaolinite ~2%, dravite ~7%, illite ~30% (mean) kaolinite 2-7%, dravite 3-12%, illite 36-55% (mean)	North 2 <sup>206</sup> Pb/ <sup>204</sup> Pb ≥50 Mo, Co, Ga, Rb	North 1 ), $^{207}$ Pb/ $^{206}$ Pb $\leq 0.4$ (partial) (elevated, partial)	Proximal Main	
	dickite 63-90% (mean) lithofacies contact	chlorite >5% (r HREE, Hf, Y (ele LREE (anomalo	chlorite >5% (mean) HREE, Hf, Y (elevated, partial) LREE (anomalous, partial)		
	unconformity mineralization	Not to scale: I Ansdell – SEG 2018 Key	ooking east stone – Footprints U Site	GUTTEY 2018 GEEA IN PRESS	



from Common Earth Model



Ansdell – SEG 2018 Keystone – Footprints U Site





#### from Common Earth Model





#### **Millennium Geochemistry**



Selection: Uranium\_Deposit\_Footprints\_Mill





from Common Earth Model





#### **EDA: Millennium Volume**



NSERC CRSNG

**Bertelli** 

#### Four main groups were identified: Illite, kaolinite, chlorite, dravite



#### ~30% of chl/dr groups are anomalous with respect to U



#### Minerals and Key Elements

- Uranium enrichments in all the groups, although predominantly in the chlorite group.  $\odot$ Similar behaviour for Bi, As, Cu, V, Zn, Pb Mo, and <sup>206</sup>Pb. Chlorite Dominant
- The chlorite group is characterized by an overall enrichment in Co and Ni.  $\odot$

















Pb206\_p\_ppm





B ppm





Zn\_p\_ppm



Pb207\_p\_ppm

Normal Score



Dravite Dominant

Kaolinite Dominant

Ag\_ppm

Co\_p\_ppm\_D

Normal Score

ó

Illite Dominant

Aa

-2 -1

-2 - 1

-3

Ag\_ppm

Ο. 10

\_\_\_\_ppm

0.0



Shape

Size

U Background

∧ U Anomalous

 U Background U Anomalous



#### **Pathfinder Mass Balance**





LA-ICP-MS chemical mapping of interstitial assemblages, detrital grains, and cements provides new insights into the distribution and inventory of pathfinder elements Concentration of element in mineral (Norm mineralogy, LA-ICPMS of mineral)

0.1

patially accounter not accounted for 0.1 1 10 100 Concentration of element in whole-rock analysis (ppm)

Joyce 2016 MSc Queen's Joyce 2017 GAC-MAC





#### **Overview - Alteration**



NSERC CRSNG



Ansdell – SEG 2018 Keystone – Footprints U Site

#### **Fractures: McArthur River**





(MC-344-379.3) fracture face and orientation,

> White and yellow fracture coating (MC-338-504.5)



**Fractures classified on** colour, mineralogy, chemistry



Valentino 2017 MSc Queen's Valentino 2017 PDAC

Ansdell – SEG 2018 Keystone – Footprints U Site









- White and yellow fractures (Drv, KIn, III, Fe oxides (Gth))
- likely formed from hydrothermal fluids, reflected by a near neutral pH and high δ<sup>2</sup>H values of fibrous goethite, and anomalous values of U, V, and radiogenic Pb

Primary dispersion

nnovationcounci

Brown fractures (Mn oxides, Fe oxides (Gth and Hem) +/- KIn, Ilt, and Drv)

elevated Co, Ba, TI, Mn and Iow <sup>207</sup>Pb/<sup>206</sup>Pb values throughout the entire depth profile – useful vector

#### Secondary dispersion

Ansdell – SEG 2018 Keystone – Footprints U Site

Valentino 2017 MSc Queen's

### **Surficial Geology: McArthur River**

Important to understand the geological relationships in the glacial deposits to interpret results from media being sampled

- are anomalies from the glacial deposits, or mineral deposits at depth

– 500 m

canadamining

novationcouncil







Ansdell - SEG 2018 Keystone - Footprints U Site

# Pebble Counts and Stratigraphy RINTS



- <u>Drumlins are stratified</u>. Internal stratigraphy is complex
- Includes one middle horizon of more 'distal' provenance (sandstone-poor, boron depleted, and Na<sub>2</sub>O enriched) between two contrasting layers of dominantly 'local' provenance (sandstone/boron-rich and Na<sub>2</sub>O depleted) + a thin landform-conformable carapace of distal



Ansdell – SEG 2018 Keystone – Footprints U Site Scott 2017 GAC-MAC



#### **Predictive Map Rationale**



- Existing surficial maps in the eastern Athabasca Basin are based mostly on geomorphology (streamlined vs hummocky) and dominant surficial sediments (glaciofluvial vs till)
  - No information on till lithology and provenance, and therefore prospectivity
- Airborne radiometric datasets cover the whole Athabasca basin and if predictive mapping accurately maps sediments in the study area then it may be able to be applied elsewhere in the basin
  - Potentially the most cost effective method for mapping sediments





#### **Radiometrics and Pebbles**



	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6		
Range (K%)	<0.3	0.3-0.4	0.4-0.5	0.5-0.6	0.6-1.0	>1.0		
Average (K%)	0.279	0.348	0.433	0.555	0.692	1.227		
# of Samples	15	28	14	14	5	4		



NSERC-CMIC FOOTPRINTS

canadamining innovationcouncil

Ansdell - SEG 2018 Keystone - Footprints U Site

#### **Predictive Map**

canadamining nnovationcouncil





#### Local best to sample

Scott in prep MSc Waterloo Scott 2017 GAC-MAC

Ansdell – SEG 2018 Keystone – Footprints U Site



**Multimedia Surficial Sampling** 

- All sample media on Grid 3 give the highest relative U concentrations and the most radiogenic Pb\*
- Higher U and rad. Pb results on Grids 2 and 3 suggest the P2 fault is a conduit for secondary dispersion even away from the high-grade ore body
- Higher U and rad. Pb boulders on Grid 2 may represent glacial dispersion from Grid 3



Ansdell - SEG 2018 Keystone - Footprints U Site



## **Overburden Stripping**



Develop methods to separate the gravity contribution due to variable thickness glacial sediments from the gravity contribution due to alteration in the sandstones

Better resolution of alteration at depth

Modelling of synthetic data

canadamining

novationcouncil

- Independent, constrained and joint inversions of gravity, seismic refraction, magnetic, and EM data, and spectral analysis and frequency filtering

Most advanced inversion techniques







### Magnetic, Gravity and VTEM



#### Density

Mag Sus



lagSus (SI)

5.511e-03

0.0041332

0.0027555

0.0013777

0.0000+00



Vertical sections of constrained joint inversion models of gravity and magnetic data (2 clusters – overburden and sandstone; coupling factor of  $\rho$ =10)

**3D** geological model and mesh for VTEM data and **3 different** resistivities 500n for overburden 3 km Structure Resistivity (ohm-m) 1.0E+8 500 & 1800 & 6000 Overburden Sandstone 1000 Alteration Zone Pelite Ouartzite 8 Graphitic Fault 50 70000 9 Granitoid gneiss -2500m 7500n

Ansdell – SEG 2018 Keystone – Footprints U Site

Darijani 2018 PhD Memorial

NSERC-CMIC FOOTPRINTS

### Summary of Modelling





Ansdell – SEG 2018 Keystone – Footprints U Site

Darijani 2018 PhD Memorial

# Geophysics example: Seismic NSERC-CMIC FOOTPRINTS

- Qp can be extracted from first-break amplitude analysis
- Energy decay shows directional (anisotropic) dependence
- Seismic attenuation ≠ Overburden effect (Qp reflects deep lithological and petrophysical variations, and locally very low)

Seismic Footprint !



#### Seismic: 3D Alteration Imaging SERC-CMIC 3D model: Millennium (Q=24) **Downhole amplitude** 10<sup>5</sup> **Nearly vertical alteration** Amplitude decay in 3D VSP Ln(A)=-0.00521\*depth+11.39 confirms attenuation zone observed in surface From near surface to seismic data unconformity Inverted to produce 10 Limited width (thin?) 3D Q model Limited lateral extent (fluid Q tomography pathway?) Long-lived, soft, porous, 10<sup>3</sup>∟ 200 low Q provides 300 400 500 600 700 depth (m) geotechnical McArthur River – Q=7.69 challenges **Extremely low**



Ansdell – SEG 2018 Keystone – Footprints U Site Shi in prep PhD Toronto



<b>U</b> Site	B, dravit	te (sandstone clasts, various size fractions) ◀ <sup>207</sup> Pb/ <sup>206</sup> Pb-U (tree cores, soil boulders) < 100 m	Up to 5 km
Footprint	MFd	Mg/K Mg/Al Mo-Co-Ga-Rb <sup>206</sup> Pb/ <sup>204</sup> Pb- <sup>207</sup> Pb/ <sup>206</sup> Pb Mg/Al Mo-Co-Ga-Rb <sup>206</sup> Pb/ <sup>204</sup> Pb- <sup>207</sup> Pb/ <sup>206</sup> Pb <sup>206</sup> Pb <sup></sup>	Up to 5 km Up to 5 km Up to 5 km Up to 5 km
Summary	MFc	Mg/K ← Mg/Al ← Mo-Co-Ga-Rb ← <1 km → HREE-Y ← <1 km → Ga-Cs ← alkali deficient dravite-sudoite ← Low Q, high attenuation <100 m	Up to 10 km Up to 5 km Up to 5 km Up to 5 km
Dominated by	MFb	Mo-Co-Ga-Rb ← < 1 km LREE ← < 1 km HREE-Y ← < 1 km Ba-Sr-P ← Low Q, high attenuation <100 m	Up to 5 km
geochemistry and mineralogy	MFa	Mg/K ← Mg/Al ← Mo-Co-Ga-Rb ← <1 km HREE-Y ← <1 km 206Pb/204Pb-207Pb/206Pb ← <1 km 206Pb/204Pb/204Pb-207Pb/206Pb ← <1 km 206Pb/204Pb/204Pb-207Pb/206Pb ← <1 km 206Pb/204Pb/204Pb/206Pb ← <1 km	Up to 5 km Up to 5 km
Lesher 2017 Exploration 17 canadamining innovationcouncil	Increasing concentration	Unconformity McArthur River and Millennium McArthur River only Millennium only	with up to 70m or more displacement Signals most pronounced along structures to surface and laterally

### **U Site Summary**



- Footprint in sandstone focus of the project
  - mineralogy/geochemistry
- Molar ratios (e.g. Mg/AI) broaden footprint, and machine learning supports "chimneys" of select elements
- Fractures can provide access to the surface, but understanding surficial geology vital
- Subtle alteration in sandstones (dominated by quartz) means variation in physical properties is small
- Challenging to remove the geophysical signature of the basement, and the overburden to image this subtle alteration
  Most important product may be toolkit of methods, what can be done/what can't, for exploration at depth





#### Remembering



#### • Site Leaders - Kevin Ansdell and Kurt Kyser





University of Saskatchewan – 1981-1995 Queen's University and Queen's Facility for Isotope Research 1995 - August 29, 2017

Ansdell – SEG 2018 Keystone – Footprints U Site

