

[Click to view Poster Panel 1 in PDF format.](#) (4.26 MB)

[Click to view Poster Panel 2 in PDF format.](#) (5.51 MB)

[Click to view Poster Panel 3 in PDF format.](#) (3.59 MB)

PS Gas Shale Reservoir Characteristics from the Pennsylvanian of Southeastern Utah, USA*

S. Robert Bereskin¹, John D. McLennan², Thomas C. Chidsey³, Jr., and Tarn D. Bereskin¹

Search and Discovery Article #10216 (2009)

Posted November 13, 2009

*Adapted from poster presentation at AAPG Convention, Denver, Colorado, June 7-10, 2009. Please see related articles: The Gothic Shale at Greater Aneth Oil Field, Paradox Basin, Southeast Utah: Seal for Hydrocarbons and Carbon Dioxide Geologic Sequestration, Search and Discovery article #80068 and A Tale of Two Breccia Types in the Mississippian Leadville Limestone, Lisbon Field, Paradox Basin, Southeastern Utah, Search and Discovery article #30107.

¹Bereskin and Associates, Inc., Salt Lake City, UT (bereskin@xmission.com)

²Energy and Geoscience Institute, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT

³Utah Geological Survey, Salt Lake City, UT

Abstract

Calcareous, organic-rich, dark brown-gray mudstones from the Paradox Basin of southeastern Utah are now recognized as gas-productive. These comparatively thin deposits (less than 80 feet each based on log analysis), belonging to the Hovenweep, Gothic, and Chimney Rock shales of the Paradox Formation cycles, possess modest TOC values (1-2%) and appear transitional (oil to gas window) in terms of locally-pertinent thermal maturation. Nonetheless, gas production has been obtained through vertical stimulations in several wellbores.

Several cored intervals are beset by multiple types of subvertical, calcite-lined fractures that commonly propagate into stratigraphically-proximal brittle limestones or into silty dolostone interbeds. Because the mudstones themselves possess modest (2-3%) gas-filled porosity and nanodarcy permeability values in comparison to other well-known Middle to Upper Paleozoic black shale

gas reservoirs, the hydrocarbon recoveries are perhaps greatly aided by natural fractures, and by the modest, but still substantial (3-5%), intercrystalline voids found in the associated dolostones. Thin section work and scanning electron microscopy have visually verified the quantitative results obtained through core-based, petrophysical methods.

As part of this study, rock mechanics data have also been assembled for a multitude of purposes, including calibration for logging-prediction, potential development of an optimal vertical stimulation program, as well as future design of horizontal and/or deviated drilling and completion methodology. Considerable work was accomplished in terms of measuring standard moduli (Young's modulus, Poisson's ratio) and ultrasonic wave velocities through triaxial compression testing.

Acknowledgements

Funding for this ongoing research was provided, in part, by the Unconventional Onshore Program of the Research Partnership to Secure Energy for America (RPSEA), Sugar Land, Texas, for the Utah Geological Survey project titled "Paleozoic Shale-Gas Resources of the Colorado Plateau and Eastern Great Basin, Utah: Multiple Frontier Exploration Opportunities," subcontract no. 07122-45. Support is also being provided by the Utah Geological Survey (UGS), Bereskin and Associates, Inc., the Energy and Geoscience Institute at the University of Utah, GeoX Consulting, Inc., and Halliburton Energy Services. Special thanks are extended to TerraTek – Schlumberger for their assistance with the laboratory analyses including the SEM descriptions.

The poster design was by Stevie Emerson of the UGS; James Parker and Cheryl Gustin of the UGS prepared the figures; Michael Laine, Ammon McDonald, Thomas Dempster, and Brad Wolverton of the UGS Core Research Center assisted with sample preparation and core photography.

References

Bereskin, S.R., and J. McLennan, 2008, Hydrocarbon potential of Pennsylvanian black shale reservoirs, Paradox Basin, southeastern Utah: Utah Geological Survey Open-file Report 534, 53 p.

Chidsey, T.C., Jr., S. Wakefield, B.G. Hill, and M. Hebertson, 2004, Oil and gas fields of Utah: Utah Geological Survey Map 203DM, scale 1:700,000.

Choquette, P.W., 1983, Platy algal reef mounds, Paradox Basin, in P.A. Scholle, D.G. Bebout, and C.H. Moore, editors, Carbonate depositional environments: American Association of Petroleum Geologists Memoir 33, p. 454-462.

Hite, R.J., 1960, Stratigraphy of the saline facies of the Paradox Member of the Hermosa Formation of southeastern Utah and southwestern Colorado, *in* K.G. Smith, editor, Geology of the Paradox Basin fold and fault belt: Four Corners Geological Society, Third Field Conference Guidebook, p. 86-89 (Ch-10).

Hite, R.J., and F.W. Cater, 1972, Pennsylvanian rocks and salt anticlines, Paradox Basin, Utah and Colorado, *in* W.W. Mallory, editor, Geologic atlas of the Rocky Mountain region: Rocky Mountain Association of Geologists Guidebook, p. 133-138 (Ch-10).

Reid, F.S., and C.E. Berghorn, 1981, Facies recognition and hydrocarbon potential of the Pennsylvanian Paradox Formation, *in* D.L. Wiegand, editor, Geology of the Paradox Basin: Rocky Mountain Association of Geologists Guidebook, p. 111-117.

Wray, L.L., A.D. Apeland, H.T. Hemborg, and C. Brchan, 2002, Oil and gas fields map of Colorado: Colorado Geological Survey Map Series 33, scale 1:500,000.