



Petro physical evaluation of in the one of oil wells Abadan plain hydrocarbon basin

Naser, Ebadati*¹, Mohammad, Zarbalizadeh²

1) Department of Geology, Islamshahr Branch, Islamic Azad University, Islamshahr, Iran

2) Department of Geology, Science and Research Branch of Tehran Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding Author: drebadati@iaau.ac.ir

Received: 9 Oct.2016; accepted: 15 Feb.2017

Abstract

Abadan plain is considered as the one of the hydrocarbon sub basins in south of Zagros in Iran which from the tectonic viewpoint is known as the Arabian plate north platform terminal. Existence of basic differences in Abadan plain sediments due to the structural geological viewpoint with Zagros sediments area and Dezful embayment shows the petro physical studies necessary. So for determination of porosity, shale volume and water formation saturation from important rank factors after the determination by the probes and data sending and their processing as the full set logs, related data was prepared as the diagrams and then determination and evaluation was performed by two certain and probable methods. As it is observed in Sarvak Formation interval, the results showed that major lithology was carbonate and also observed with Dolomite rocks in the depth of 3250-3575 and 3450-3475 m. From the oil reservoir viewpoint, 3125-3265 m is the best hydrocarbon depth in wells, though beside oil zone, freshwater zone is present but due to the 30% water saturation sub limit can almost have more oil reservoir. But due to the very low quality, next predicts for depth less than 3125 and 3240 m till the Sarvak interval ending has no certainty.

Keywords: Sarvak Formation, petro physics, oil reservoir, Abadan plain, geo log.

1. Introduction

Porosity, shale volume and formation water saturate are of the most important reservoir factors. In one hand electrical facieses modeling and its separation is one analytical and certain method for petrophysical well mapping categorizing which have a crucial role in hydrocarbon reservoir development (Basheni 2009 and Kadkhodaie 2009). Petrophysical evaluation which is the data interpretation and description of well logs is one of the most important factors in reservoir rock features and hydrocarbon reservoir properties evaluation (Ghassem-Alaskary 2012 and Riblier 2005). In the other hand, knowing the manner of sediment facieses and diagenetic in one basin scale and oil field will effectively help in understanding the 3D spaces distribution of porosity, permeability and capillary pressure in that field. For this purpose it is necessary that in facieses analysis by using well mapping, at first formations should be divided in acceptable layers units, then the relationship between the petrophysical parameters will be obtained from determined charts and features of rock facieses as the interpretable certain or statistical form (Kim et al. 1998).

1.1 Geological setting

structural study area located of the south Zagros folded belt. North boundary and eastern north is limited to the Zagros (Soosangerd Anticline, Abteimor Mansory) and after passing from the south of petroleum field Rag eSefid enters the Persian Gulf. Abadan plain's south boundary is Persian Gulf and Arabia (Ghazban et al. 2009). Abadan plain is a part of Mesopotamian plain which from the geological viewpoint is considered as the Arabian platform (Fig. 1). Due to the young alluvial coverage, geological knowledge is limited to the obtained results of petroleum excavation and geophysics studies. These data show that in coverage sub sediment, Paleozoic and Mesozoic deposits will be limited (Aghanabati 2004). Existence of basic difference in Abadan plain sedimentation base of structural geology with the

Zagros folded belt and Dezful embayment shows the integrated and ordered study necessity for better identification of area and considered area which have lots of uncertainties (Ghazban et al. 2009). The most important difference in Abadan plain with Zagros folded belt and Dezful embayment are as follows:

- The anticlines of Abadan plain against the Zagros folded belt and Dezful embayment have a south-north trend.

- Anticline slope in this area is smooth against the Zagros sediment area and Dezful embayment.

- There is no anticline protrusion in this area. and Existence of anticlines in this area is the result of basement faults.

- Against the Zagros folded belt and Dezful embayment which less depth reservoirs (Asmari Formation) have importance, in this area, deeper reservoirs (Khami and Bangestan Group) are important.

- Reservoirs of this area are not structural and facieses changes have an important role in oil trap creation (Sadooni 2014).

1.1.2 Groups and formations of Abadan plain analysis

Against the Zagros folded belt and Dezful embayment which less deep reservoirs (Asmari Formation) have importance, in this area, deeper reservoirs (Khami and Bangestan Group) are important.

Due to the young alluvial coverage, geological knowledge is limited to the obtained results of hydrocarbon excavation and geophysics studies. These data show that in coverage sub sediment, first and second periods' deposits will be limited (Aghanabati 2004). In the following we pointed to two groups according:

1. Khami Group: khami Group includes the Sormeh, Heith, Fahlian, Gadvan and Dariyan Formations. Actually carbonate sequence relates to the Jurassic-cretaceous. Khami reservoirs mainly are placed in central Zagros (Dezful, Izeh), Abadan plain and beyond its shore. A part of the Khami reservoirs is developed sporadically in Lorestan, Fars, Bandar Abbas




Figure 1. Case study general position of oil field and Abadan plain (SW of Iran).

province and Persian Gulf (Gazban et al. 2009).

2. Bangestan Group: this group name is adopted from the Bangestan mountain placed innorth of Behbahan city. For the first time, Bangestan limestone name referred to the layers that were known as the medium Cretaceous, Roodist limestone, Hyporitelimestone or Lashtegan limestone before. This group is considered from old to new as the Kazhdomi Formation, Sarvak, Soorgah and Ilam. This group from bottom toward up identifying one sediment cycle which lasted from Albian to Campanian.

2. Material and Methods

In the study oil field after determining by the probes and data sending and processing as the full set logs, related information is prepared as the diagrams (Fig 2,3 and 4) and then for determination and evaluation is prepared as the determine and Multimin methods (Masoudi et al. 2012 and Rabiller 2005). Generally after project creation and data and information loading, main work on data after preparation and data editing will be began and concludes the evaluations and results. Totally, it is common that for better results, to perform some of the editions and determination on data, this is namely includes the data preparation and their editing and pre determination leve-

Table 1. Well tops formation in one well of studies oil field.

Formation	Top (meter)	Thickness (meter)
Mishan	1384	64
Gachsaran	1440	637
(Cap Rock)	2015	70
Asmari	2085	284
(ahwaz Sandstone)	2210	125
pabdeh	2369	257
Gurpi	2626	275
ilam	2901	121
Sarvak	3022	693
Kazhdumi	3715	260
Dariyan	3975	185
gadvan	4160	102
Total depth	4262	

land environmental correction and in the following regarding to the two determine and multimin evaluation methods, evaluating process ends and in the next level, after determining the study oilfield facieses, general conclusion will be obtained.

Parameters picking: One of the methods which are important in volume determination of some petro-




Figure 2. Correction level and gamma correction output diagram in well.




Figure 3. Environment correction Neutron log.




Figure 4. Environment correction Density log.

physical parameters is the cross plots drawing and their estimation (Buryakovsky 2012). In this project, this part is one of the most important working parts. The purpose of cross plots is that instead of drawing the logs rather than depth, they will be drawn rather than each other, therefore in this part some of the parameters are constant and apparent matrix properties will be evaluated like the minerals (Tiab 2012).
RHOMA-UMA plot: At first for well in reservoir, we draw the diagram and related parameters will be picked.

In reservoir Sarvak Formation well limited part, the whole data will be around Calcite and this indicates that reservoir major part in each Sarvak Formation reservoir interval and the density is 2.7 g/cm^3 and u equals 15.5 B/cm^3 . Regarding to the third dimension of figure which was colored we will notice that GCR & GR value is more blue and indicating the Shale

very low value in the reservoir (Sfidari et al. 2012).

Sound-density cross plot: This diagram includes the density on sound and its main performance will be the identification of occurred range between the minerals and lithology (Fig 6).

Data distribution in well follows from triangle pattern placed between calcite, anhydrite and shale. In other words data distribution range in well is located between 2.65 g/cm^3 , 2.8 g/cm^3 and 2.7 g/cm^3 densities.

M.N plot: M.N plot is performed for intervals lithology interpretation which has special complexities. This cross plot use from three porosity diagrams for each lithology related with the M and N quantity (Sadegi 2009). M and N are the lithology slopes respectively in Sonic/Density and Density/Neutron diagrams. For this purpose it is independent from porosity and provides a cross plot for identifying lithology. In other words, each point on cross plot can be drawn in several triangles for different minerals (Fig. 7). Therefore for each point we obtain several lithology by combining different minerals (Schlumberger 2000).

Book obtained relationships are as follows:

$$M = (\Delta t_f - \Delta t_i) / (p_f - p_i)$$

$$N = (\phi_{nf} - \phi_{ni}) / (p_f - p_i)$$

It should be noted that these parameters are different from presented parameters in Archi formula and only is similar from the name viewpoint. In one hand dependency of porosity parameter is rather dependent from fluids and effects on rock matrix and this will lead to determination of more accurate lithology (Lee et al. 2002 and 2009).

Regarding to the obtained diagrams for Sarvak receivers formation we noticed that in Sarvak Formation well, is limestone dolomite, anhydrite and shale.

Neutron-density cross diagram (N-D): This diagram has major application in determination of lithology type and porosity value as the graphs. Regarding to the three parallel lines located on data which indi-




Figure 5. U-density cross sectional diagram for well.




Figure 6. Sound-density cross plot for well.




Figure 7. Cross m-n diagram for well.




Figure 8. Relative porosity cross diagram with neutron density in well.

icates the lithology type (Sedigi 2009 and Tang et al. 2008). Reservoir is limestone with some dolomite part (Fig. 9). Because medium line and under line is dolomite and limestone line. From one hand lines which are crossed parallel from these lime and dolomite lines, indicates the porosity in Sarvak reservoir regarding to the porosity diagram is determined between 5-15%. From the quality viewpoint we can identify the Reservoir as the medium till good ones.

Density-gamma-well diameter cross diagram: Regarding to the gamma value is 3API for calcite, 5 API for dolomite and 20API for quartz. We can conclude that data major volume is located in calcite and dolomite range and this is a confirmation on Sarvak reservoir (Fig. 10).

Neutron-gamma-well diameter cross diagram:

Regarding to four well, PEF changes are located in colors between green with 4-6 range. We can select the 3.9-4.1 for calcite and 4.5-5.1 for dolomite. We should state that PEF value for anhydrite is near the dolomite but regarding to this value that is determined in Sarvak reservoir determination, almost and certainly there is no anhydrite (Fig. 11).

Sound-gamma-well diameter cross diagram:

Regarding to the presented cross plots, changes value is from 152-260 micro sec which regarding to this value sound value for calcite is 160.7 μ s/m and for dolomite 152.5 μ s/m. Abundant percent of data are dolomite and calcite. Finally we should say that read value from sound log for shale equals the 262.46 μ s/m and by an overview, Sarvak reservoir has very low shale volume (Fig 12).

3. Results and discussion

Shale volume determination: for determining the




Figure 9. lithology type determination and porosity diagram N-D in well.




Figure 10. rho-gr-cali cross diagram in well




Figure 11. nphi-gr-pee cross plot.

shale volume there is different methods in software. One of the best methods which usually used for shale volume is the shale volume determination by the gamma method:

$$v_{sh} = (CGR_{log} - CGR_{max}) / (CGR_{min} - CGR_{max}) \quad (3)$$

Which in this formula CGR_{log} is read value from log and CGR_{min} and CGR_{max} respectively is the minimum and maximum which for clean formation and maximum value for shale is determined.

Porosity determination: in porosity determination we should attend to some points. At first data types in one hand have the log type, so is the basic role in determination. This point that data are complete or full set. Selecting the considered method is permitted and only the determination sequence is our main procedure. As we know that, porosity from the appearance viewpoint is two first and second types and their summation will obtain the total porosity. From one hand regarding to the basis of one reservoir is fixed on porosity which has the ability of fluid transportation easily (Hearst et al. 2000). Therefore determination main procedure is second porosity determination and at first for first porosity determination we should use from sonic method and secondly for porosity determination we should use from neutron-density method. First step (porosity determination from sound log): sound speed in formation relates to the rock matrix components and porosity distribution in them. The sound passing time in four minerals is:

Quartz 55, Dolomite 43.5, Calcite 47.5 and Anhydrite 50. Porosity formula determination by the sound log

is the following (Wiley formula):

$$\phi_{sonic} = (\Delta t_{log} - \Delta t_{ma}) / (\Delta t_f - \Delta t_{ma}) \quad (5)$$

Which Δt_{log} is read value from sound log in each point Δt_{ma} is the passed time in rock and Δt_f is the passed time in porous liquid. And sound passing time in reservoir fluids for oil is 189, gas 250 and water is 185. Second step (porosity determination by the neutron-density (chart lookup):

As we know that neutron-density logs, contains the first and second porosity. values for some minerals are as follows:

Water saturation determination: saturation of a formation is a fraction of occupied pores by the fluid (Shlumberger 2000). This value is stated as the percent, considered fluids in petrophysics are water (s_w), oil (s_o) and gas (s_g) which summation of all parameters is 1. Therefore with water saturation value determination we can compute the presented hydrocarbon information:

$$s_w^n + s_o + s_g = 1 \text{ or } 100\% \quad (6)$$

Saturation is a parameter that is determined by using from resistance logs data (Izadi et al. 2013). We should note that all of the water saturation determination is based on the obtained formula from Archie experimental results. Archie without the attention to the clay minerals and conductor focused his studies on the clean rock or clean sand. Archie formula (1942) is stated as the following:

$$s_w = (a R_w) / (\phi^m R_t) \quad (7)$$

Which in this formula: s_w is water saturation, R_w is formation water resistance in formation, R_t is formation real resistance, ϕ is porosity, a is winding coefficient usually 1, m is the cementation rate (1 for sand-

Table 2. Neutron- density values for some minerals.

minerals	Density(g/cm ³)	Neutron
Quartz	2.65	-0.02
Dolomite	2.85	-0.05
Calcite	2.71	0
Anhydrite	2.98	-0.02

stone and 2 for limestone), n is the saturation which changes from 1.8 till 2.5. Usually for simplicity 2 will be considered.

Finally we should state that sometimes which clean rock is presented in formation, Archie formula is not valid so part of the shale water saturation is considered beside main shale which this will be problematic in estimation and model creation of oil volume, so other methods are presented which is determined shale water saturation (Chen et al. 2012). In the present study for water saturation determination we use from three Archie, Dual Water and Indonesia methods so we can see which one is better (Fig. 13).

3.1 Comparison the model of water saturation in cross-plot

Lithology determination: One of the main applications of data mapping is identify and determining lithology (Fertle 1987). In fact, the identification of lithology is an important step in the evaluation properties of reservoir, and will help to isolated reservoir from non-reservoir area (Mishra 2005). To calculate lithology at first calculated a series of parameters and

variables into a well Then, depending on the type and number of constituent minerals in the interval zone, zone or interval method used to draw the lithology model (Moline 1995).

Water resistance formation: Formation water resistivity is a function of salinity and temperature and it can be measured by producing water or estimated 100% Porosity at saturation of water with cross plot porosity of Resistance (Perez 2003). This parameter that sometimes called fossil water is water that not contaminated by drilling mud and fills the empty spaces in the intact rock formations. Calculated this parameter and knowing it to calculate water saturation on resistivity graphical is essential. One of the important logs to calculated resistivity is (SP) log (Tiba 2012).

4. Conclusion

Determined petrophysical parameters in Sarvak Formation in this field show the vast heterogeneous and discontinuous in productive and reservoirs properties, so it is suggested that before selecting the final intervals for lattice work operation, to use from the estimators and methods for confirming the reservoirs




Figure 13. Comparison three methods of Indonesia, Archie and dual water for well water saturation

evaluation which in heterogeneous reservoirs (or segmenting that area to the homogenized parts) more accurate evaluations will be performed. As it is observed in Sarvak Formation interval, major lithology was carbonate and observed in 3250-3575 and 3450-3475 m. And sometimes between the Dolomite rock layers. From the oil zone viewpoint, 3125-3265 m is the best oil depth in wells, though beside oil reservoir, free water is present but due to the 30% sub limit can almost have more hydrocarbon zone. But due to the very low quality, next predicts for depth less than 3125 and 3240 m till the Sarvak interval ending with low quality and unknown lithology, there is no interpretable description.

Acknowledgement

The authors thank from the industrial and exploration management for the cooperation in the early data and petroleum exploration group guidance.

References

- Aganabati A., 2004. Geological of Iran. published Geological survey of Iran. edition 1,606p.
- Basheni M. 2009. Predicting petrophysical characteristics of the reservoir using artificial neural networks and well data encryption, master's thesis, Faculty of Engineering, Kerman University of Iran, 153p.
- Buryakovskiy L. Chilingar. G V., Rieke H H., Shin S. 2012. Fundamentals of the Petrophysics of Oil and Gas Reservoirs, Wiley publish, 400 pages, ISBN: 978-1-118-34447-7.
- Chen J., Bastidas R., Laguros G., Petro D., Scott E., Campion K. 2012. Deepwater reservoir characterization: From core description to 3D Facies propagation and reservoir modeling, Adapted from oral presentation at AAPG International Conference and Exhibition, October 23-26, Milan, Italy, pp 143-151.
- Fertle W. H., 1987., Open Hole Cross Plots Concepts-A Powerful Technique in Well Log Analysis, *J. Pet. Tech*, Vol. 33: 535-549.
- Ghassem-Alaskari M. K. 2012. Advanced well logging, Petroleum University of Technology. Iran, Setayesh press. 396p.
- Ghazban F., Motiei H. 2009. Petroleum geology of the Persian gulf, Tehran University publish, 707p.
- Hearst J. R., Nelson P. H., Paillet F. L. 2000. Well Logging for Physical Properties: A Handbook for Geophysicists, Geologists, and Engineers. New York, John Wiley and Sons, 483 p.
- Izadi M., A. Ghalambor 2013. A new approach in permeability and hydraulic flow unit determination: *SPE Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering*, 16 (3): 257-264.
- Kadkhodaie-Ilkhchi A., Amini A. 2009. A fuzzy logic approach to estimating hydraulic flow units from well log data: A case study from the Ahwaz Oilfield, south Iran: *J. Pet. Geol.* 32: 67-78.
- Kim J.W., Lim J.S. 1998. Automated Electrofacies Determination using Multivariate Statistical Analysis, Proceeding Conference for The Korean Society of Petroleum Geology, pp. 10-14.
- Lee S.H., Datta-Gupta A. 1999. Electrofacies characterization and permeability predictions in carbonate reservoirs: Role of multivariate analysis and nonparametric regression: SPE Annual Technical Conference and Exhibition OMEGA, Houston, Texas, pp. 409-421.
- Lee S.H., Kharghoria A., Datta-Gupta A. 2002. Electrofacies Characterization and Permeability Predictions in Complex Reservoirs: *SPE Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering*, pp. 237-248.
- Masoudi P., Tokhmechi B., Jafari M.A., Moshiri B. 2012. Application of fuzzy classifier fusion in determining productive zones in oil wells. *Energy Exploration and Exploitation*. 30 (3): 403-415.
- Masoudi P., Tokhmechi B., Bashari A., Jafari M.A. 2012. Identifying productive zones of the Sarvak formation by integrating outputs of different classification methods, *J. Geophys. Eng.*, Vol. 9(3): 282-290.
- Mishra S., Datta-Gupta A. 2005. The role of Electrofacies, lithofacies, from Well logs: A comparative analysis using classification Trees, *Reservoir Evaluation & Engineering*, pp. 143-155
- Moline R.G., Bahr J.M. 1995. Estimating spatial distributions of heterogeneous subsurface characteristics by regionalized classification of Electrofacies: *Mathematical Geology*, Vol. 27(1): 3-22.
- Perez H.H., Datta-Gupta A. Mishra S. 2003. The role of

- electrofacies, lithofacies and hydraulic flow units in permeability prediction from well logs: A comparative analysis using classification trees: Society of Petroleum Engineers Annual Conference and Exhibition, Denver, Colorado, October 5-8, SPE Paper 84301, 11 p., doi: 10.2118/84301-MS.
- Rabiller Ph., Ye S. J. 2005. New Tools for Electrofacies Analysis: Multi Resolution Graph-Based Clustering, SPWLA 41st Annual Logging Symposium Transaction, June 4-7, Paper PP.67-75.
- Sadegi M. 2009. Using neural network to estimate porosity and water saturation using well log data and comparison with the methods of neutron logs and density logs, Shahrood University Press. 234p.
- Sadooni F. N. 2014. Petrophysical Characterization of the Late Cretaceous Carbonates of Central Iraq: a Quantitative Method for Reservoir Subdivision Conference Proceeding: Reservoir Quality of Clastic and Carbonate Rocks: Analysis, Modelling and Prediction, London, UK; 05/2014, pp.154-157.
- Schlumberger 2000. Inc. Log interpretation-Principles / Application, Schlumberger Educational Services, Houston, TX, 198 p.
- Serir L., Ramasso E., Zerhouni N. 2012. Evidential Evolving Gustafson-Kessel Algorithm for Online Data Streams Partitioning Using Belief Function Theory, *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 53 (5): 747-768.
- Sfidari E., Kadkhodae-Ikhchi A., Najjari S. 2012. Comparison of intelligent and statistical clustering approaches to predicting total organic carbon using intelligent systems. *Journal of petroleum science and Engineering*, 86:190-205.
- Tang H., White C.D. 2008. Multivariate statistical log-log-facies classification on a shallow marine reservoir. *J. Pet. Sci. Eng.*, 61: 88-93.
- Tiab D., Donaldson E.C. 2012. Petro physics, Third Edition: Theory and Practice of Measuring Reservoir Rock and Fluid Transport Properties, third Edition, Amazon publish 915p.