Reservoir Quality and Petrophysical Model of the Tarn Deep-Water Slope-Apron System, North Slope, Alaska

Kenneth P. Helmold, Alaska Division of Oil & Gas
Wayne J. Campaign, ConocoPhillips Alaska, Inc.
William R. Morris, ConocoPhillips Co.
Douglas S. Hastings, Brooks Range Petro. Corp.
Steven R. Moothart, ConocoPhillips Alaska, Inc.

Pacific Section AAPG
May 8, 2006

Alaska Department of
Natural
Resources

Outline

- Regional setting
- Petrology of sandstones
- Facies and reservoir quality
- Regional reservoir quality model
- Petrophysical model
- Conclusions

Conclusions

- Reservoir quality is initially controlled by textural parameters related to turbidite elements
- Channels are the best reservoirs followed by lobes, crevasse splays and levees
- Mechanical compaction exerts a strong regional control on reservoir quality
- Reservoir quality of Brookian sandstones can be accurately predicted prior to drilling
- Petrophysical model is complicated by abundance of structural clay and low-density zeolite

Location of Tarn Field



Stratigraphic Column of North Alaska



Tarn Slope-Apron Deposits



- Located at toe-of-slope
- Fed by slope gullies
- Fairly small features

Outline

- Regional setting
- Petrology of sandstones
- Facies and reservoir quality
- Regional reservoir quality model
- Petrophysical model
- Conclusions

Brookian Sandstone Composition



Cenomanian sands are lithic rich with abundant volcanic rock fragments

Typical Brookian Sandstones



Paleocene (Flaxman)
Chert rich
Medium-grain sand



Cenomanian (Tarn)
Volcanic glass rich
Analcime cement



Albian (Torok)
Argillaceous rich RF
Generally lack cement

100 µm

Brookian Sandstone Phi-K Trends



1 md K cutoff = Phi of 12% Paleocene, 15% Albian, 17% Cenomanian

Analcime and Microcrystalline Rims











Outline

- Regional setting
- Petrology of sandstones
- Facies and reservoir quality
- Regional reservoir quality model
- Petrophysical model
- Conclusions



Channel Facies



Sedimentary Facies:	**Amalgamated Ta, some Tb, Tabc, Tc (climbing at margins)**
Bed Thickness:	**Thin to very thick**
Grain Size:	**Very fine to fine-grain sand**
Avg. Porosity:	**20 %**
Avg. Permeability:	**33 md**
Avg. H_2O saturation:	**46 %**
Avg. Dispersed clay:	**4 %**

Lobe Facies



Sedimentary Facies:	Tace, Tabe, Tabce, Tbce, occasional Tae, Tbe
Bed Thickness:	Thin to very thick, rare very thin
Grain Size:	Very fine- to fine-grain sand, rare mud
Avg. Porosity:	18 %
Avg. Permeability:	7 md
Avg. H_2O saturation:	61 %
Avg. Dispersed clay:	8 %

Crevasse Splay Facies





Sedimentary Facies:	Tce (climbing), Tb, Tabe, Tace, rare Tbe, Tbce
Bed Thickness:	Very thin to thick
Grain Size:	Very fine- to lower fine-grain sand, mud and silt
Avg. Porosity:	17 %
Avg. Permeability:	3 md
Avg. H_2O saturation:	64 %
Avg. Dispersed clay:	13 %





Levee Facies



Sedimentary Facies:	Tce, Tc
Bed Thickness :	Very thin, rare thin
Grain Size:	Very fine-grain sand, mud and silt
Avg. Porosity:	16 %
Avg. Permeability:	2 md
Avg. H_2O saturation:	68 %
Avg. Dispersed clay:	22 %

Depositional Control on Reservoir Quality



Best reservoirs in channels; poorest in levees and basin plain

Effect of Grain Size on Phi-K



Channel
Lobe
Crev Splay
Levee
Basin Plain



Facies control on grain size is largely responsible for reservoir quality variability

Outline

- Regional setting
- Petrology of sandstones
- Facies and reservoir quality
- **Regional reservoir quality model**
- Petrophysical model
- Conclusions

Brookian Erosion Map





Erosion estimates derived from sonic compaction curves

mapped by Matt Burns, from Rowan et. al., 2003; USGS Open-File Report 03-329

Maximum Burial Depth (Dmax) = Present Depth (ft) + Brookian Erosion (ft)

Brookian Phi-K vs. Dmax



- Locally, reservoir quality is controlled by grain texture related to turbidite elements
- Regionally, reservoir quality is controlled by compaction





Brookian Reservoir Quality Model

		MEAN Ø		MEAN K	
Well	Dmax	$Ø_{predict}$	$Ø_{actual}$	$K_{predict}$	K_{actual}
Well A	Increasing Burial Depth	21.7	18.4	6.12	8.08
Well B		21.3	20.0	5.24	13.97
Well C		18.4	13.9	1.88	3.00
Tarn D		17.9	20.5	1.55	37.11
Tarn E		17.7	15.2	1.45	1.49
Tarn F		17.3	16.3	1.24	3.43
Tarn G		17.0	15.6	1.14	1.65
Well H		16.7	14.8	1.00	1.79
Well I		16.5	16.9	0.95	6.94
Well J		16.5	15.5	0.95	2.08
Well K		16.4	15.8	0.89	3.70
Well L		16.1	13.1	0.82	1.99
Well M		16.1	20.3	0.80	11.83
Well N		16.1	16.7	0.80	6.72
Well O		15.4	8.2	0.62	0.02
Well P		14.9	8.4	0.52	0.04
Well Q		14.8	13.9	0.51	0.45
Well R		13.8	9.5	0.36	0.06
Well S		12.7	11.5	0.24	0.35
Well T		12.4	10.0	0.21	
Well U		10.8	9.3	0.12	0.08
Well V		7.9	5.9	0.04	
Well W		4.7	9.9	0.01	

Albian Prospects   Cenomanian Prospects





Compaction of Brookian Reservoirs



< 7000' Dmax
ø = 18 %
k = 12 md



7000-9000' Dmax
ø = 15 %
k = 3 md



> 9000' Dmax
ø = 11 %
k = 0.1 md

100 µm

Outline

- Regional setting
- Petrology of sandstones
- Facies and reservoir quality
- Regional reservoir quality model
- Petrophysical model
- Conclusions

Petrophysics: Overview of the Problem



- GR log does not distinguish sand
- RT and RHOB logs do show sand character
- Problem results from presence of analcime and structural clay
- Standard shaly-sand log model is not appropriate

Effect of Clay on Log Model



- Reservoir contains 30-50% argillaceous rock fragments
- Lithics are older and more compacted than surrounding shales



- Lithics are “pinpoints” of conductivity that are not connected
- Structural clay has little impact on reservoir quality

Effect of Analcime on Log Model



- Grain densities vary over a wide range from 2.52 – 2.78
- A single lithology model would yield poor results
- Solve for Φ and grain density allowing for mineralogical variation
- Model must use more than one porosity tool

Resistivity – Mineral Effect Cross Plot



- Calculate mineral effect on Neutron log from mineral abundances (TS & XRD) and Log Parameter Table
- Plot mineral effect against raw logs to determine "best fit"
- Deep resistivity has best correlation



- Neutron correction is developed from the resistivity log
- Calculate phi and grain density from standard Neutron/Density cross plot

Model Results





- Results are for multiple wells
- No log normalization or individual customization

Conclusions

- Reservoir quality is initially controlled by textural parameters related to turbidite elements
- Channels are the best reservoirs followed by lobes, crevasse splays and levees
- Mechanical compaction exerts a strong regional control on reservoir quality
- Reservoir quality of Brookian sandstones can be accurately predicted prior to drilling
- Petrophysical model is complicated by abundance of structural clay and low-density zeolite


The End