



Characterising Top Seal in the Vulcan Sub-Basin, North West Shelf, Australia

Tomasz Kivior

B.Sc. (Hons) Petroleum Geology and Geophysics – University of Adelaide

Australian School of Petroleum

Thesis submitted to the University of Adelaide in fulfilment of the requirement
of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

July 2005

Table of Contents

Characterising Top Seal in the Vulcan Sub-Basin, North West Shelf, Australia	i
Tomasz Kivior	i
B.Sc. (Hons) Petroleum Geology and Geophysics – University of Adelaide.....	i
Australian School of Petroleum	i
Thesis submitted to the University of Adelaide in fulfilment of the requirement of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.....	i
July 2005	i
Chapter 1 Introduction and General Geology	1
1.1 General Geology.....	1
1.2 Introduction and Objectives	2
1.3 Geological setting of the Vulcan Sub-Basin	4
1.3.1 Structural Configuration.....	4
1.3.2 Tectonic Evolution	5
1.4 Stratigraphic Evolution.....	9
1.4.1 Stratigraphic Evolution – Permian to mid-Jurassic	11
1.4.2 Stratigraphic Evolution – mid Jurassic to Cretaceous	13
1.4.3 Stratigraphic Evolution – Paleocene to Recent	16
1.5 Petroleum Plays in the Vulcan Sub-Basin.....	17
Chapter 2 Methodology.....	19
2.1 Project Aim	19
2.2 Database	20
2.3 Biostratigraphic, wireline log and seismic interpretation	22
2.3.1 Biostratigraphic data.....	23
2.3.2 Wireline Log Data.....	28
2.3.3 Integration of biostratigraphic and wireline log data	28
2.3.4 Seismic Interpretation.....	30
Chapter 3 Seal Analysis	32
3.1 Introduction	32
3.2 Capillary Seals.....	32
3.2.1 Buoyancy Pressure	34
3.2.2 Entry Pressure, Displacement Pressure and Threshold Pressure 36	
3.2.3 Interfacial Tension	36
3.2.4 Wettability	37
3.2.5 Pore Throat Radius	38
3.2.6 MICP.....	38
3.2.7 Threshold pressure	40
3.2.8 Conformance	40
3.2.9 1 st derivative – a consistent way of removing conformance	41

3.3	Seal Capacity (Column Height)	42
3.4	Cuttings vs Core	43
3.4.1	Introduction.....	43
3.4.2	Sample Preparation.....	44
3.5	Analytical Techniques.....	53
3.5.1	Sampling Strategy.....	53
3.5.2	Preparation of Samples for MICP	54
3.5.3	SEM Preparation and Methodology	55
3.5.4	XRD Preparation	55
3.6	Seal Potential.....	56
3.6.1	Seal Capacity	56
3.6.2	Areal Extent of the Seal.....	56
3.6.3	Seal Thickness	57
3.6.4	Seal Integrity.....	57
3.7	Practical Seal Potential Assessment.....	59
3.7.1	Seal Capacity	61
3.7.2	Areal Extent	62
3.7.3	Seal Thickness	63
3.7.4	Seal Integrity.....	63
3.7.5	Practical Seal Potential	69

Chapter 4 Biostratigraphy, wireline and seismic interpretation – Results and Discussion 70

4.1	Introduction	70
4.2	Biostratigraphic Analysis	70
4.2.1	Biostratigraphy Introduction	70
4.2.2	Biostratigraphic Results.....	72
4.3	Geological Interpretation of Wireline Log Motifs	73
4.3.1	Lower Vulcan.....	73
4.3.2	Upper Vulcan.....	76
4.3.3	Echuca Shoals Formation	81
4.3.4	Jamieson Formation.....	85
4.3.5	Woolaston, Gibson and Fenelon Formations.....	91
4.4	Seismic Interpretation.....	96
4.4.1	Seismic expression of wireline events	96
4.4.2	Results & Discussion – Log Signature Maps.....	103
4.4.3	Log Signature Maps Discussion.....	117

Chapter 5 Sample Analysis - Seal Capacity, SEM & XRD 118

5.1	Introduction.....	118
5.1.1	Lower Vulcan.....	119
5.1.2	Upper Vulcan.....	124
5.1.3	Echuca Shoals.....	127
5.1.4	Jamieson	133
5.1.5	Woolaston/Gibson/Fenelon – WGF	142

Chapter 6 Seal Potential – Results and Discussion 150

6.1	Lower Vulcan.....	151
6.1.1	Results.....	151

6.1.2	Analysis and Discussion.....	161
6.2	Upper Vulcan.....	163
6.2.1	Results.....	163
6.2.2	Analysis and Discussion.....	166
6.3	Echuca Shoals.....	168
6.3.1	Analysis and Discussion.....	171
6.4	Jamieson Formation.....	174
6.5	Woolaston/Gibson/Fenelon.....	180
Chapter 7	Conclusions	187
7.1	Introduction.....	187
7.2	Mercury Intrusion Capillary Pressure.....	187
7.3	Seal Potential.....	188
7.4	Implications for Hydrocarbon Exploration.....	189
7.5	Recommendation for Future Work.....	190
Chapter 8	References.....	192

Appendix A – Seal capacity results for wells analysed. Presented with accompanying wireline logs, scanning electron microscope and x-ray diffraction results where available.

Appendix B – Seal potential analysis detailed spreadsheets.

Abstract

The occurrence of palaeo-oil columns in Late Jurassic and Cretaceous reservoirs in the Vulcan sub-basin indicates that hydrocarbon accumulations have leaked. It is unclear whether accumulations have leaked through breach of top seal or fault seal. This study evaluates the top seal potential for hydrocarbon accumulations in the Vulcan Sub-basin. For this purpose a top seal potential assessment methodology was developed.

Seal potential (SP) combines seal capacity (the hydrocarbon column height that can physically be held back by seal), seal geometry (the areal extent and thickness of the seal) and seal integrity (rock mechanical properties of the seal). Seal capacities are measured using mercury injection capillary pressure calculations. Areal extent is evaluated using sedimentological and sequence stratigraphic principles. Thickness is determined empirically from well logs and seismic data. Seal integrity is derived from a brittleness index. In addition, a component relating to data quality and quantity is included in seal potential evaluation.

The main sample set for this study is composed of drill cuttings. For this reason a comparison of seal capacity results measured from cuttings and cores has verified that cuttings samples provide accurate seal capacity measurements.

Lower Vulcan Formation SP ranges from low to high due to variations in seal capacity and thickness risks as well as data quality and quantity. High SP occurs in the main depocentres and low SP occurs on the palaeo-highs and basin margins. Upper Vulcan Formations SP ranges from low to moderate due to variations in seal capacity. Moderate SP occurs in the depocentres and low SP on the basin margins. In the Echuca Shoals Formations seal capacity,

seal extent and integrity as well as data quality and quantity are good.

However seal thickness is inconsistent, resulting in SP variations from good to poor as a function of thickness. Jamieson Formation has high seal capacities, is thick and areally extensive, however the seal potential is locally moderate (for example on the Ashmore Platform) due to seal integrity risk. SP for the Jamieson Formation is controlled by the thickness and the amount of calcite present in the rock, which affects the brittleness of the formation and hence the seal integrity. The Woolaston, Gibson and Fenelon (WGF) Formations are grouped together as a regional seal and in this group SP varies from low to high. The WGF rocks generally have high seal capacities, are areally extensive and thick with good data quality and quantity sample set wise.

Where the WGF is predominantly marl and calcilutite some of the highest brittleness index values were recorded and hence the WGF has a low SP in these areas.

Based on the overall seal potential analysis, almost all seals in the area are capable of holding back hydrocarbon columns greater than present or palaeocolumns recorded. This suggests that hydrocarbon leakage in the Vulcan Sub-Basin did not occur as a result of top seal capillary failure.