Reservoir Quality and Characterization of the Codell Sandstone, NE Silo Field Area



Matthew Keator

Anticipated Graduation: August 2023

Outline



- DJ Basin cross section and geologic background
- Subsurface maps
- Production update NE Silo Helis wells
- Facies distribution and description
- Log analysis and XRD/XRF
- Reservoir Characterization

Typical Cross Section - Denver Basin



- Denver Basin is deepest in the western portion and shallows to the east
- Formations shallowly dip to the west in the eastern portion of the basin

(Sonnenberg 2015)

Location and Stratigraphy – Denver

Typical

Depth

4300'

4800'

6800'

7100'

7600'

7800'



- Silo Field is located in Laramie County, Wyoming
- Encompasses townships 15 and 16N and sections 63, 64, 65W
- Produces out of the Niobrara and Codell, which is a tight sand reservoir
- Source rock intervals include the Sharon Springs Member, multiple benches of the Niobrara, Carlile, and Graneros
- Oil migrates into the Codell from one of the mentioned source rock intervals

MUDTOC

Codell Structure Map (SS) - Silo Field



- Codell subsea depth in Silo Field ranges from approximately -2000 to -3000 feet, with subsea depth in NE Silo Field near -2000 feet
- Follows general structure of DJ Basin
- Silo Field sits on the eastern part of the basin, so the Codell dips gently to the west

Codell Isopach Map – Silo Field





- Codell approximately 25-30 feet thick in Silo Field
- 30 feet thick in NE Silo Field
- Thickens to the north

Study Wells





Monthly Production





Monthly Production





Monthly Production



Core Locations







Facies Distribution - Cain





Facies 1

 Very fine-grained sandy siltstone, poorly sorted, heavily bioturbated, with inoceramid fragments, with pyrite nodules, not oil stained under UV light





Facies 2

 Mudrock with mostly clay sized particles, some burrows are filled with very fine sandstone, with vertical fractures





Facies 3

 Very fine-grained sandy siltstone, poorly sorted, heavily bioturbated, with inoceramid fragments, with pyrite nodules, not oil stained under UV light, higher sand content than Facies 1





Facies 4

 Heavily bioturbated, very fine-grained silty sandstone, poorly sorted, with Teichichnus and Skolithos burrows, shows oil staining in core





Facies 5

 Low angle cross stratified to ripple stratified very finegrained sandstone, moderate to wellsorted, with organic rich shale beds and mud drapes, with Planolites and Skolithos burrows, shows avid oil staining





Facies 6

 Very fine-grained silty sandstone, moderately poorly sorted, heavily bioturbated, with a higher sand content than Facies 4, shows heavier oil staining than Facies 4 under UV light





UV Light Photo - Cain



Log and XRD/XRF - Cain





21



UV Light Photo - Berry Unit 13-9



Log and XRD - Berry



































Distribution of Common Marine Ichnofacies

Typical trace fossils include: 1) Caulostrepsis; 2) Entobia; 3) echinoid borings; 4) Trypanites; 5) Teredolites; 6) Thalassinoides; 7, 8) Gastrochaenolites or related genera; 9) Diplocraterion (Glossifungites); 10) Skolithos; 11,12) Psilonichnus; 13) Macanopsis; 14) Skolithos; 15) Diplocraterion; 16) Arenicolites; 17) Ophiomorpha; 18) Phycodes; 19) Rhizocorallium; 20) Teichichnus; 21) Planolites; 22) Asteriacites; 23) Zoophycos; 24) Lorenzinia; 25) Zoophycos; 26) Paleodictyon; 27) Taphrhelminthopsis; 28) Helminthoida; 29) Cosmorhaphe; 30) Spirorhaphe.

Seilacher, 2007



Tucker, 2007

SRA Niobrara C Marl & Greenhorn Limestone



| Sample ID | | | | | | Source Rock Ar | nalyses | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------|---------------------|----------------------|----------|------------|----------------|---------|-----------|-----------|------------|------|------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|-----------|-------------|
| Project/ | Rock | Well | Formation | Upper | Sample | Percent | Leco | HAWK | HAWK | HAWK | HAWK | Calculated | Hydrogen | Oxygen | S2/S3 | S1/TOC | Production |
| Sample ID | ID | Name | Name | Depth | Туре | Carbonate | TOC | S1 | S2 | S3 | Tmax | %Ro | Index | Index | Conc. | Norm. Oil | Index |
| | | | | (ft) | | (w t%) | (wt%) | (mg HC/g) | (mg HC/g) | (mg CO2/g) | (°C) | (RE TMAX) | (S2x100/TOC) | (S3x100/TOC) | (mg HC/mg CO2) | Content | (S1/(S1+S2) |
| RHOG-191001-001 | 1-1 GM | Cain 16-63-2-11-1CH | Niobrara C Marl | 7,475.00 | Core Chunk | 33.59 | 1.79 | 0.48 | 7.77 | 0.35 | 425 | 0.49 | 434 | 20 | 22 | 27 | 0.06 |
| RHOG-191001-002 | 1-2 GM | Cain 16-63-2-11-1CH | Niobrara C Marl | 7,508.30 | Core Chunk | 31.56 | 1.43 | 0.43 | 5.73 | 0.39 | 427 | 0.53 | 401 | 27 | 15 | 30 | 0.07 |
| RHOG-191001-003 | 1-3 GM | Cain 16-63-2-11-1CH | Niobrara C Marl | 7,530.10 | Core Chunk | 54.68 | 1.72 | 0.49 | 8.90 | 0.60 | 425 | 0.49 | 517 | 35 | 15 | 28 | 0.05 |
| RHOG-191001-004 | 1-4 GM | Cain 16-63-2-11-1CH | Codell Sands tone | 7,648.80 | Core Chunk | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| RHOG-191001-005 | 1-5 GM | Cain 16-63-2-11-1CH | Codell Sands tone | 7,654.50 | Core Chunk | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| RHOG-191001-008 | 1-6 GM | Cain 16-63-2-11-1CH | Greenhorn Limes tone | 7,677.00 | Core Chunk | 43.92 | 1.80 | 0.75 | 7.06 | 0.26 | 429 | 0.56 | 392 | 14 | 27 | 42 | 0.10 |
| RHOG-191001-007 | 1-7 GM | Cain 16-63-2-11-1CH | Greenhorn Limes tone | 7,679.00 | Core Chunk | 50.49 | 1.51 | 0.44 | 5.64 | 0.28 | 428 | 0.54 | 374 | 19 | 20 | 29 | 0.07 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

- Ro values from Niobrara sidewall cores average values near 0.5 thermally immature
- Ro values from Greenhorn average near 0.55 – thermally immature
- S1 and S2 peaks indicate low levels of free hydrocarbons and high levels of hydrocarbons that formed during pyrolysis indicating high generating potential
- High HI and low OI indicate marine source
- Tmax below 430 (°C) represents immature organic matter



- HI and OI values indicate an oil/gas prone Type II kerogen source
- PI < 0.1 indicates thermally immature
- NiobraraGreenhorn

GeoMark Geochem Analysis





MICP





Water Saturation





18 20

Porosity at NCS, percent



Water Saturation Calculations





35

Flow Capacity and Storage Capacity Vs. Dept





Porosity and Permeability Vs. Depth



Flow Units





Conclusions



- NE Silo Field shows good production potential based on production data and geologic reservoir characterization techniques.
- Six distinct facies were identified in the Sage Breaks Shale and Codell Sandstone section of the Cain 16-63-2-11-1CH core based on sedimentary structure and differing sand to clay percentages.
- Facies 5 and 6 show the highest amount of intergranular porosity, as well as oil staining.
- Total porosity is consistent through the core; Permeability is the main factor contributing to better flow units.
- Source rock analyses indicate a working petroleum system that is immature in the NE Silo Field area, with oil likely migrating from deeper within the field, with hydrocarbon contributions likely from Niobrara, Greenhorn/other

Thank you to our Sponsors!





In-Kind Supporting Companies



Mike Johnson & Associates







COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES MUDTOC

0

COLORADO