Identifying Jurassic tight gas sandstones using 3C-3D seismic data.

Diego Alexander Valentin



SCHOOL OF GEOSCIENCES

Overview

- 1. Introduction
 - 1.1 Location
 - 1.2 Summary of the field
 - 1.3 Problem
 - 1.4 Objective
- 2. Geology of the area
- 3. Dataset
- 4. Petrophysics
- 5. 3C-3D Registration and Interpretation
- 6. Future work

1. Introduction



1.2 Summary of the Field

Well map distribution and net sand thickness of the York Ss Tennessee Colony field





• From 11 wells drilled based on only the interpretation of conventional 2D and 3D seismic only 5 wells present thicknesses larger than 50' at the York level.

•Can other type of geophysical data help us to diminish the uncertainty when planning new development wells?

1.2.1 W-E Structural dip cross section Tennessee Colony field



1.2.2 N-S Structural strike cross section Tennessee Colony field



1.3 Problem

 The analysis of the conventional 3D seismic and attribute extraction (amplitude extraction and AVO), have proved to be not reliable in showing the actual distribution of the York sand in the field., because:

Sand/shale contrast is subtle
Small P impedance contrast
Class IIP/II AVO response

2. Conventional seismic data unsuitable for AVO attribute extraction
> Poor far offset SNR
> Low frequency content
> Noise (multiples)
> Tuning effects

1.4 Objective

 The objective of this research is to test the capabilities and the reliability of attribute extractions from the conventional 3D and 3C-3D seismic data as an alternative effective lithology indicators.

2. Geology of the area

2.1 Structural and tectonic elements of the East Texas Basin



2.2 Mid Jurassic – Early Cretaceous stratigraphy of the East Texas Basin



3. Data set

3.1 Availabe data



- 1. One 3D conventional seismic cube (76.5Miles²).
- One 3C-3D seismic cube (9Miles²).
- 3. Dipole logs at the Bossier Formation for the wells: Gregory A1, Gregory A2, TDCA1, Royall C3R, Toole A1.
- 4. One multicomponent VSP validate the horizon picking well: Gregory A3 (deep section).

4. Petrophysics

Question

 Is there any physical attribute (acoustic impedance, Vp/Vs, density), that can be extracted from the seismic and be considered as a good lithology indicator?



4.2 Vp/Vs vs. P impedance crossplot



4.3 Vp/Vs vs. density crossplot



4.4 Comparison of crossplots between wells TDCA1 and TOOLEA1 TDC A-1



Answer

- From the well logs analysis is there any physical attribute (acoustic impedance, Vp/Vs, density), that can be extracted from the seismic and be considered as a good lithology indicator?
- A/. From the crossplots I conclude that density and Vp/Vs ratio could be used as effective lithology discriminators.
- Taking into account the low reliability of attribute extraction from the conventional 3D seismic and that density is a difficult attribute to extract from the seismic, I propose that a good alternative to identify lithology is a Vp/Vs extraction from a join interpretation of the conventional 3D and the 3C-3D seismic data.

5. 3D and 3C-3D Registration and Interpretation

Question

 Is it possible that interval Vp/Vs ratio, attribute extracted from the registration and interpretation of conventional 3D and 3C-3D seismic data, could be a reliable lithology indicator that diminish the uncertainty when looking for the York sands in the Tennessee Colony area?

5.1 Work flow chart for interval Vp/Vs estimation

GA-3 PP VSP and 3D PP Match

GA-3 PP and PS VSP Match

GA-3 PS VSP and 3C-3D Match

PP and PS Well Synthetic and 3D-3C seismic Match

PP and PS Horizon Picking

Event matching between the PP and PS seismic volumes

Interval Vp/Vs extraction from PP-PS data and interpretation of the results

 $\frac{Vp}{Vs} = \frac{2\Delta Tps - \Delta Tpp}{\Delta Tpp}$

PP seismic data fair field process 2005

ILN 1227 3D conventional seismic



PS seismic data Donatello 3C-3D survey

Band pass Filter 4-12-20-24Hz

1.00

0.96

0.92 0.88

0.84 0.80

0.76 0.71 0.67

0.63

0.59 0.55 0.51

0.47

0.43 0.39

0.35

0.31

0.27 0.22 0.18

0.14 0.10 0.06

0.02

-0.02-0.06-0.10-0.14

-0.18 -0.22

-0.27

-0.31

-0.35

-0.39

-0.43 -0.47

-0.51 -0.55 -0.59

-0.63

-0.67 -0.71 -0.76 -0.80

-0.84-0.88 -0.92 -0.96

-1.00





Comparison between original and filtered PS sections



VSP-3C-3D Match

ILN 1257





Corrections made to match the information:

1.Time shift of 632ms to match the PP and PS VSP's 2.Time of Shift of -172ms to the 3C-3D volume to match. 3.No phase shift was made

VSP-3C-3D Match



PreSTM+fn175+fxy+9sq+miles.bri

3 Miles

PS ILN1257



Royall C-3R PP and PS synthetic match



Arbitrary Line Comparison



RYA-

GA-1

Toole-2

GA-2

VP/VS Interval maps



Isochron map Bonner – Cotton Valley Limestone



Amplitude Extraction at the York Horizon in the 3C-3D Volume



Answer

- Is it possible that interval Vp/Vs ratio, attribute extracted from the registration and interpretation of conventional 3D and 3C-3D seismic data, could be a reliable lithology indicator and diminish the uncertainty when looking for the York sands in the Tennessee Colony area?
- Yes?,
- The interval Vp/Vs ratio extraction is showing that:
 - 1. Low Vp/Vs ratios coincide with zones where the calculated isochrons from the conventional 3D seismic data are high and are interpreted as paleolows. These paleolows could have acted as catchment places for turbiditic currents.

2. Despite of the fact that in productive wells like GA-1, GA-2 and Royall C-3R the interval Vp/Vs ratios are higher than the cut off value of 1.6, the map is showing possible pathways that sediment bearing currents could have taken when this kind flows develop.

Future Work

1. Refine the horizon interpretation to get more reliable interval Vp/Vs maps.

- 2. Inversion.
- 3. Conclusions.



Acknowledgements



Edger Forum and its sponsors

Jackson School of Geosciences Dr. Robert Tatham Dr. Mrinal Sen Dr. Kyle Spikes Thomas E. Hess Effie L. Jarret

Anadarko Ronald Harris Monica Miley Bossier team