

## APPENDIX 3

### Joins interpretation from boreholes located in Eastern Pomerania

In the Opalino 4 borehole ( $n = 84$ ) three main JS 1 - 3 ( $st = 018^\circ$ ,  $303^\circ$  and  $340^\circ$ ) are well distinguishable with clear maxima on the contour plot. Additionally, based on a small number of observations, ambiguous JS 4 ( $st = 088^\circ$ ) was detected.

In the Opalino 3 borehole ( $n = 254$ ) only JS 2 ( $st = 293^\circ$ ) clearly corresponds to one of the main joint sets but has a noticeably smaller dip angle. The second conspicuous JS associated with strikes of  $315^\circ$  is enigmatic and apparently a local feature, which also occurs in Opalino 2 well. However, some similarities visible as bimodality of JS 2 occur also in Wysin 1 and Lubocino 1. Another JS striking  $001^\circ$  is typical only for Opalino 3. It is ambiguous if this one belongs to JS 1, JS 3, or is not associated with them. Sets striking  $016^\circ$  and  $043^\circ$  also consist of a small number of observations, however, their orientations correspond to similar ones in other data (JS 1 and JS 5). A fracture cluster striking  $048^\circ$  can be ignored as an artefact.

The Opalino 2 borehole data ( $n = 125$ ) shows similarity to Opalino 3, mainly through the occurrence of  $324^\circ$  striking JS and less steep JS 2 ( $st = 296^\circ$ ), which shows two closely lying maxima on the contour plot. Beside them, JS 1 ( $st = 013^\circ$ ) is clearly visible, while JS 5 ( $st = 058^\circ$ ) is ambiguous due to a small number of observations.

The Wysin 1 borehole data present a small number of observations ( $n = 50$ ), where three main sets are clearly distinguishable, JS 1 ( $st = 017^\circ$ ) and JS 3 ( $st = 339^\circ$ ) create relatively clear maxima, while JS 2 ( $st = 291^\circ$ ) is blurred, with two maxima. Still, it is ambiguous whether this is the effect of a low number of observations or a feature similar to that observed in the Opalino 2 and Opalino 3 datasets. Additionally, JS 4 ( $st = 082^\circ$ ) and JS 5 ( $st = 061^\circ$ ) are present, but their maxima are uncertain due to low observation count. Cluster striking  $345^\circ$  can be ignored as an artificial one.

The Miłowo 1 borehole data consist of the highest number of observations ( $n = 1273$ ). It is highly dominated by JS 1 ( $st = 028^\circ$ ). Furthermore, the other joint sets, JS 3 ( $st = 338^\circ$ ), JS 4 ( $st = 080^\circ$ ), and JS 2 ( $st = 318^\circ$ ), are also present. However, from this three JS, only JS 2 creates clear maxima on the contour plot.

In the Borcz 1 borehole ( $n = 714$ ) the situation is similar to the previous one. There is a clear dominance of JS 1 ( $st = 025^\circ$ ), despite this also JS 3 ( $st = 336^\circ$ ), JS 2 ( $st = 291^\circ$ ), and JS 5 ( $st = 048^\circ$ ) are recognizable. JS 3 and, especially, JS 5, do not show clear maxima on the contour plot.

The Lubocino 1 borehole data ( $n = 94$ ) consist of three main joint sets (JS 1, JS 2, and JS 3 – striking  $025^\circ$ ,  $303^\circ$ , and  $343^\circ$ , respectively), from which JS 1 and JS 2 are relatively wide comparing to the other data. Additionally, JS 2 presents multimodal behaviour, which makes it difficult to clearly determine its orientation. The presence of JS 4 ( $st = 079^\circ$ ) is indisputable, while the cluster with strikes of  $291^\circ$  is ambiguous.