Abstract

The science of surface geochemical exploration for oil and gas has made much progress since observations in early 1900’s of geochemical and mineralogic changes associated with soils and sediments above oil and gas fields in the Middle East and the US Gulf Coast. This was followed by development of many geochemical and non-seismic methods for detection of hydrocarbons in soils, sediments, waters, and atmosphere. There is today a wider acceptance of hydrocarbon microseepage and hydrocarbon detection surveys due to improved analytical techniques, a better understanding of the migration mechanism and its varied near-surface effects, improved survey design and sampling strategies, and improved interpretation skills. Well-documented case histories of microseepage surveys appear regularly in peer-reviewed journals and books, and these illustrate the wide applications of this technology in all stages of exploration -- from frontier basin reconnaissance, to high-grading exploration leads and prospects based on their likely hydrocarbon charge, to identifying bypassed pay in mature fields, to monitoring production-related hydrocarbon drainage over time.

Nevertheless, many explorationists remain skeptical about the benefits of this technology. What more must be done to increase the acceptance of this reliable but under-utilized technology by the exploration community? We need a unified hydrocarbon microseepage model that links the many seemingly unrelated hydrocarbon-induced changes to surface and near-surface sediments. This model should predict the observed geochemical, mineralogical, and geophysical changes in different geologic settings. Also helpful would be better and more consistent integration of surface and subsurface data. Inferring the depth of origin for hydrocarbons that have migrated to the surface remains impossible with rare exceptions, however, detailed chemical and isotopic characterization of the hydrocarbons in seepage anomalies shows promise for enabling us to more reliably infer a depth of origin in the future, as does integration of geochemical data with passive electromagnetic data and gas chimney data. Lastly, we should strive for real-time hydrocarbon data acquisition where possible. If we can accomplish most if not all of these tasks in the next 5-10 years, we may find that our exploration colleagues are not only more willing to add this technology to their exploration tool box, but may actually base exploration decisions on hydrocarbon microseepage data.
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ABSTRACT
The science of surface geochemical exploration for oil and gas has made much progress since observations in early 1900’s of geochemical and mineralogic changes associated with soils and sediments above oil and gas fields in the Middle East and the US Gulf Coast. This was followed by development of many geochemical and non-seismic methods for detection of hydrocarbons in soils, sediments, waters, and atmosphere. There is today a wider acceptance of hydrocarbon microseepage and hydrocarbon detection surveys due to improved analytical techniques, a better understanding of the migration mechanism and its varied near-surface effects, improved survey design and sampling strategies, and improved interpretation skills. Well documented case histories of microseepage surveys appear regularly in peer-reviewed journals and books, and these illustrate the wide applications of this technology in all stages of exploration -- from frontier basin reconnaissance, to high-grading exploration leads and prospects based on their likely hydrocarbon charge, to identifying bypassed pay in mature fields, to monitoring production-related hydrocarbon drainage over time.

Nevertheless, many explorationists remain skeptical about the benefits of this technology. What more must be done to increase the acceptance of this reliable but under-utilized technology by the exploration community? We need a unified hydrocarbon microseepage model that links the many seemingly unrelated hydrocarbon-induced changes to surface and near-surface sediments. This model should predict the observed geochemical, mineralogical, and geophysical changes in different geological and geochemical settings. Ongoing research in developing a large suite of spectral and hyperspectral signatures for surface materials uniquely associated with seeps and microseeps should be encouraged and integrated in our hydrocarbon detection surveys. Also helpful would be better and more consistent integration of surface and subsurface data. Inferring the depth of origin for hydrocarbons that have migrated to the surface remains impossible with rare exceptions, however, detailed chemical and isotopic characterization of the hydrocarbons in seepage anomalies shows promise for enabling us to more reliably infer a depth of origin in the future, as does integration of geochemical data with passive electromagnetic data and gas chimney data. Lastly, we should strive for real-time hydrocarbon data acquisition where possible. If we can accomplish most if not all of these tasks in the next 5-10 years, we may find that our exploration colleagues are not only more willing to add this technology to their exploration tool box, but may actually base exploration decisions on hydrocarbon microseepage data.

EARLY HISTORY AND OBSERVATIONS
Before 1900, and going back almost 5000 years, people living in the vicinity of oil and gas seeps have exploited them. And, has has long been pointed out by petroleum industry historians, the presence of these seeps has led to the majority of early oil and gas discoveries and the recognition of future productive trends. As interesting as this very early history is, the history of scientific surface geochemical exploration starts at the beginning of the 20th Century.

1900-1935: The association of mineralogic changes and hydrocarbon seepage has been recognized since the earliest days of petroleum exploration. Many early explorationists noted the correlation of productive areas not only with seeps but also with paraffin, water, and water contamination and geophysical highs. Santulli (1936) reported that such features were instrumental in the discovery of 70% of American Gulf Coast fields. Harris (1908) was among the first to report the presence of pyrite and other sulfides in strata overlying oil fields associated with Louisiana salt domes. Reeves (1922) observed the discolored surface sediments in the Cement Field area in Oklahoma, and noted the intense carbonate cementation over the crest of the Cement structure. Thompson (1933) observed that sulfur and pyrite are commonly associated with Permo oil fields.

1925-1935: The first attempt to relate near-surface hydrocarbons to subsurface oil or gas accumulations was made in Germany in 1929 and reported by Laubmeyer in 1929. He drilled holes to depths of 1-2m, sealed them, and after 24-48 hours removed a sample of the enclosed air for analysis. Results showed that soil air from holes above a gas accumulation contained higher concentrations of methane than air removed from holes from non-productive areas. In 1932, Russian investigators began similar studies. Sokolov (1935) improved on Laubmeyer’s technique by deepening the holes to 2-3m and removing most of the air initially present before collecting air for analysis. In addition to methane, Sokolov and colleagues found that their samples also contained a “heavy” fraction, presumably ethane and higher light hydrocarbons.

1935-1950: Research in the USA began in 1936, but from the very beginning the soil staff was investigated as the sampling medium rather than the soil air. These early investigators (Rosaire, 1938; Horvitz, 1939) reasoned that analysis of the adsorbed hydrocarbons in soil would yield higher hydrocarbon concentrations than would soil air. Other advantages were that samples could be collected and shipped and stored more easily, and sampling could be done in all areas, including offshore. Other early American proponents of surface geochemistry were Ludwig Blau (Humble Oil, Eugene McDermott (founder of GSI, later to become Texas Instruments), Everett DeGolyer and William Douchesherer. Rosaire was founder of Subterrex and hired Horvitz to work for him. Horvitz later founded Horvitz Research Laboratories and provided industry with soil hydrocarbon data until the mid-1980s.

During the last 40 years, the results of continuing academic and industry research, as well as many hundreds of individual hydrocarbon detection surveys, have further expanded the array of geochemical and non-seismic hydrocarbon detection methods available to us, as well as greatly improved our understanding of hydrocarbon migration and its varied near-surface expressions.
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Geological and Non-Seismic Detection of Hydrocarbons
Geological and non-seismic detection of hydrocarbons is a search for chemically and/or geologically identifiable surface or near-surface occurrences of hydrocarbons and their alteration products, which serve as clues to the location of undiscovered oil and gas accumulations.

Conventional vs Geochemical Exploration Methods
Finding Traps vs Finding Hydrocarbons

Why is Concept of Microseepage Controversial?
• Since microseepage not normally a visible process, direct observation has been difficult for geoscientists who rely heavily on direct observation.
• Also, if a hydrocarbon reservoir has held oil/gas for millions of years, by definition it must not be leaking even at low rates. Seals are seals.
• Making repeated and reliable measurements of the charge, to identifying bypassed pay in mature fields, to monitoring production-related hydrocarbon drainage over time.

The science of surface geochemical exploration for oil and gas has made much progress since observations in early 1900’s of geochemical and mineralogic changes associated with soils and sediments above oil and gas fields in the Middle East and the US Gulf Coast. This was followed by development of many geochemical and non-seismic methods for detection of hydrocarbons in soils, sediments, waters, and atmosphere. There is today a wider acceptance of hydrocarbon microseepage and hydrocarbon detection surveys due to improved analytical techniques, a better understanding of the migration mechanism and its varied near-surface effects, improved survey design and sampling strategies, and improved interpretation skills. Well documented case histories of microseepage surveys appear regularly in peer-reviewed journals and books, and these illustrate the wide applications of this technology in all stages of exploration -- from frontier basin reconnaissance, to high-grading exploration leads and prospects based on their likely hydrocarbon charge, to identifying bypassed pay in mature fields, to monitoring production-related hydrocarbon drainage over time.

Nevertheless, many explorationists remain skeptical about the benefits of this technology. What more must be done to increase the acceptance of this reliable but under-utilized technology by the exploration community? We need a unified hydrocarbon microseepage model that links the many seemingly unrelated hydrocarbon-induced changes to surface and near-surface sediments. This model should predict the observed geochemical, mineralogical, and geophysical changes in different geological and geochemical settings. Ongoing research in developing a large suite of spectral and hyperspectral signatures for surface materials uniquely associated with seeps and microseeps should be encouraged and integrated in our hydrocarbon detection surveys. Also helpful would be better and more consistent integration of surface and subsurface data. Inferring the depth of origin for hydrocarbons that have migrated to the surface remains impossible with rare exceptions, however, detailed chemical and isotopic characterization of the hydrocarbons in seepage anomalies shows promise for enabling us to more reliably infer a depth of origin in the future, as does integration of geochemical data with passive electromagnetic data and gas chimney data. Lastly, we should strive for real-time hydrocarbon data acquisition where possible. If we can accomplish most if not all of these tasks in the next 5-10 years, we may find that our exploration colleagues are not only more willing to add this technology to their exploration tool box, but may actually base exploration decisions on hydrocarbon microseepage data.
CHARACTERISTICS OF HYDROCARBON MICROSEEPAGE

The underlying assumption of all near-surface geochemical exploration techniques is that hydrocarbons are generated and/or trapped at depth, and leak in varying but detectable quantities to the surface. This has long been established as fact, and the close association of surface geochemical anomalies with structures, structural and stratigraphic traps, and outcropping carrier beds. A further assumption is that the geochemical anomaly at the surface can be related reliably to a petroleum accumulation at depth. The success with which this can be done is greatest in areas of relatively simple geology and becomes increasingly difficult as the geology becomes more complex. The geochemical anomaly at the surface represents the end of a petroleum migration pathway, a pathway that can range from short distance vertical migration at one end of the spectrum, to long distance lateral migration at the other extreme. Relationships between surface anomalies and subsurface accumulations can be complex. Proper interpretation requires integrating seepage data with geological, geophysical, and hydrologic data.

HYDROCARBON DETECTION METHODS

Geophysical exploration techniques can be direct or indirect, and measurements can be instantaneous or integrative. Direct techniques analyze small quantities of hydrocarbons that occur in the pore space of soil, are adsorbed onto clay minerals, or are incorporated in soil cements. Indirect methods detect seepage-induced changes to soil, sediment, or vegetation. Non-seismic geophysical methods for detection of hydrocarbons or their alteration products include satellite image analysis for seep-induced alteration such as unique spectral signatures, high-resolution aeromagnetic data to identify sedimentary magnetic anomalies that form in the seepage environment, radiometric surveys, radar and laser detection of hydrocarbon gases in atmosphere, and passive electromagnetic andtelluric measurements. A detailed discussion of these methods is beyond the scope of presentation, but a list of the more commonly used hydrocarbon detection methods appears below.

SURVEY OBJECTIVES AND SURVEY DESIGN

The design and sampling strategy for geochemical surveys must be dictated by the exploration objectives, expected target size, and logistical considerations. Best results are realized when the survey design is integrated with all available geological and geophysical data. What are the objectives of the survey? Is it to document the presence and characteristics of an active petroleum system in a frontier area, or to high-grade previously defined exploration leads and prospects based on their likelihood of hydrocarbon charge or hydrocarbon composition, or to look for bypassed oil in a mature area?

Hydrocarbon microseepage data are inherently noisy and require adequate sample density to distinguish between anomalous and background areas. Undersampling is probably the major cause of ambiguity and interpretation failures involving surface geochemical investigations. Whenever possible, use more than one hydrocarbon detection method; for example, combine a direct method with an indirect method. The use of multiple methods can reduce interpretation uncertainty because seepage-related anomalies tend to be reinforced while random highs and lows tend to cancel each other out.
MEASURING SUCCESS

In order to quantify the benefit of integrating hydrocarbon microseepage data with conventional geological and geophysical exploration data, I have compiled published microseepage survey results for more than 3000 exploration wells with the results of subsequent drilling. These prospects are located in both frontier basins and mature basins, onshore and offshore, and occur in a wide variety of geologic settings. Target depths ranged from 300 meters to more than 4900 meters and covered the full spectrum of trap styles. Prospects were surveyed using a variety of hydrocarbon detection methods including interstitial soil gas, integrated and/or acid-extracted soil gas, microbial, iodine, radiometric, and micromagnetics. The majority of wells were drilled on conventionally developed prospects after completion of the hydrocarbon detection surveys. Preliminary results were published in Schumacher (2010), and updated results are being presented elsewhere in this AAGP Conference. Of the wells drilled on prospects associated with a positive hydrocarbon microseepage anomaly, 80% resulted in discoveries. In contrast, only 14% of wells drilled on prospects without a hydrocarbon anomaly yielded a discovery. Had drilling decisions included serious consideration of the hydrocarbon microseepage data, exploration success rates would have more than doubled for most prospects.

Reducing Exploration Risk
Post-Survey Drilling Results
SYNOPSIS
3308 Wells, Various Companies, Various Methods, Various Basins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
<th>A+ in RECO</th>
<th>B+ in RECO</th>
<th>C+ in RECO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geophysical</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GeoMicrobial</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHAT WE KNOW AND WHAT MORE IS NEEDED

There is today a wider acceptance of hydrocarbon microseepage and hydrocarbon detection surveys due to improved analytical techniques, a better understanding of the migration mechanism and its varied near-surface effects, improved survey design and sampling strategies, and improved interpretation skills. Well document ed case histories of microseepage surveys appear regularly in peer-reviewed journals and books, and these illustrate the wide applications of this technology in all stages of exploration - ranging from frontier basin reconnaissance, to high-grading exploration leads and prospects based on their likely hydrocarbon charge, to identifying bypassed pay in mature fields, and even for monitoring production-related hydrocarbon drainage over time.

Nevertheless, many explorationists remain skeptical about the benefits of this technology. More must be done to increase the acceptance of this reliable but under-utilized technology by the exploration community! We need a unified hydrocarbon microseepage model that links the many seemingly unrelated hydrocarbon-induced changes to surface and near-surface sediments. This model should predict the observed geochemical, mineralogical, and geophysical changes in different geological and geochemical settings. Ongoing research in developing a large suite of spectral and hyperspectral signatures for surface materials uniquely associated with seeps and microseeps should be encouraged and integrated in our hydrocarbon detection surveys. Also helpful would be better and more consistent integration of surface and subsurface data, inferring the depth of origin for hydrocarbons that have migrated to the surface remains impossible with rare exceptions, however, detailed chemical and isotopic characterization of the hydrocarbons in seepage anomalies shows promise for enabling us to more reliably infer a depth of origin in the future, as does integration of geochemical data with passive electromagnetic data and gas chimney data. Lastly, we should strive for real-time hydrocarbon data acquisition where possible. If we can accomplish most if not all of these tasks in the next 5-10 years, we may find that our exploration colleagues are not only more willing to add this technology to their exploration tool box, but may actually base exploration decisions on hydrocarbon microseepage data.

WHAT HAS IMPROVED IN RECENT YEARS

Wider acceptance of surface geochemical exploration Improved analytical techniques Better understanding of hydrocarbon migration and surface effects Improved survey strategies, design Improved interpretation skills More applications to exploration, field development and production

WHAT MORE NEEDS TO BE DONE!

Need a unified predictive model for hydrocarbon microseepage and its varied surface and near-surface effects Better and more consistent integration of surface, subsurface, and spectral data with microseepage data Improving depth of origin estimates for microseepage anomalies In-field analysis of microseepage data when possible Expand use of drones (UAVs) for acquisition of microseepage data
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