



Faculty of Science-Geology Department

**“Relationship between Paleotectonics and Neotectonics,
of Sidi Barrani Area, Northern Western Desert, Egypt,
Using Surface and Subsurface Geological Data”**

Shaimaa Mahmoud Hassan Mohammed, B.Sc., M.Sc.

(Structure Geology)

Under supervision

Prof. Mohamed Adel Yehia
Professor of remote sensing,
Ain Shams University (Geology Department)

Prof. Ahmed Sayed Abu-El-Ata
Professor of Geophysics,
Ain Shams University (Geophysics Department)

Dr. Safwat Salah El-din Ahmed Gabr
Lecturer of Remote Sensing,
Remote Sensing Authority and Space Science

For Awarding the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

In Geological Science

2016

Acknowledgments

I am indebted to **Prof.** Ahmed Sayed Abu-El-Ata, Professor of Geophysics, Ain Shams University, **Prof.** Mohamed Adel Yehia, Professor of remote sensing, Ain Shams University and **Dr.** Safwat Salah El-din Ahmed Gabr, Lecturer of Remote Sensing, Remote Sensing Authority and Space Science for supervising the thesis, reviewing the manuscript, helpful scientific discussion and encouragement during this study.

I would like to thank Dr. Karim Abd El-Malik (Lecturer of Remote Sensing, Ain Shams University) for helping me during the progress of the study.

I am grateful to Apachy Egypt N.V. and the Egyptian General Petroleum Exploration for releasing the subsurface data used for this study.

Shaimaa El-Hadidi

Qualification

Name: Shaimaa Mahmoud Hassan Mohammed El-Hadidy

Scientific Degree: Doctoral

Department : Geology

Faculty : Science

University : Ain Shams

Graduation Year : 2016

ABSTRACT

Sidi Barrani area lies in the western part of Matruh basin, that bounded by longitudes 25° 10' and 26° 44' E and latitudes 31° 5' and 31° 44' N, and located in the northern Western Desert of Egypt. This study aims to determine the relationship between the surface and subsurface structures of Sidi Barrani area, northern Western Desert, Egypt, using the surface geologic data, as referred to the newly remote sensing technology, and the subsurface geophysical data in the form of two-dimensional seismic reflection data, with the bore-hole data, and applying the geographic information systems.

Surface geological, geomorphological and structural information were obtained from the modern remote sensing systems, like multispectral Landsat 7 ETM+, aster and the hyper-spectral Hyperion sensors for the study area. The subsurface structures and tectonic evolution of the study area were studied using one hundred 2D seismic reflection sections and supported by the logs of nine deep wells drilled in the study area. In addition, the analysis encompasses the detailed investigation of the two-way time section (TWT), structure contour maps and cross sections for defining the general trends and timing of the regional structural- tectonic deformations.

The present work is grounded to account for the enhanced information content of the sensors provided; hyper-spectral analysis methods were used, Landsat ETM+ and DEM data were prepared for processing by mosaicking and radiometric corrections to the target area. False color Landsat ETM+ (bands 7, 4, and 2 in RGB) and (aster DEM) images of the Sidi Barrani area, Egypt, highlights major ENE-WSW, NNE-SSW faults and other lineaments trending NW-SE and N-S. Ratio images (5/7, 3/1, 4/3) and (5/7, 5/1, 4) were used for lithological discrimination of different rock types.

This has been carried out in order to understand how the surface geological features generated from the subsurface structural elements of the study area. The study proved that, the Upper Jurassic- Cretaceous rocks were dissected by systems of normal faults, trending in the WNW-ESE, NW-SE and N-S directions. These fault systems were originated in association with the Cretaceous-Early Tertiary tectonic deformations related to the Tethyan plate tectonics. There are conformable relationships among the produced surface structures which are carried out using landsat ETM+ image data and the subsurface structures, that are proven from seismic reflection data. Seismic data reveal some E-W, NW-SE and N-S subsurface faults, which are recognized on the Landsat ETM+ data.

The study area was subjected to different tectonic regimes across varying time intervals, that have a major effect on the hydrocarbon accumulations.

Moreover, the foregoing NE-SW deformational phases represent the maximum structural activities occurred through the Phanerozoic section of the study area. Moreover, the older folding phases (NNW-SSE and NNE-SSW) of the Early and Late Mesozoic reveal the start of structural reworkings for the deposited Paleozoic sequences. Added, the younger wrenching phases (E-W) and N-S) reflects the tangential tectonics of oblique and strike-slip fault elements.

The relation between the paleotectonic and neotectonics of the study area is a matter of controversy. The paleotectonics stretched from the Mesozoic to the Early Tertiary, while the neotectonics extended from the Late Tertiary to the Quaternary.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

Abstract.....	4
Chapter 1.....	21
Introduction	21
1.1. About the study area	21
1.2. Previous exploration Activities in the study area	22
1.3. Description of the problem.....	30
1.4. Aims and objectives	30
1.5. Thesis skeleton	32
1.5.1. Chapter one: Introduction.....	32
1.5.2. Chapter two: Geologic Setting.....	32
1.5.3. Chapter three: Remote Sensing Analysis and Surface Structures	32
1.5.4. Chapter four: Seismic Interpretation and Subsurface Structures.....	32
1.5.5. Chapter five: Relationship between surface and subsurface structures.	33
1.5.6. Chapter six: Geographic Information System (GIS).....	33
1.5.7. Chapter seven: Relationship between Paleotectonics and Neotectonics	33
1.5.8. Chapter eight: Summary and Conclusions	33
1.5.9. References.....	34
Chapter 2. GEOLOGIC SETTING	35
2.1. Geomorphology.....	35
2.2. Surface Geology	36
2.2.1. Lithologic Outcrops:	37
2.2.1.1. Middle Miocene	38
2.2.1.2. Pliocene.....	38
2.2.1.3. Pleistocene	39
2.2.1.4. Quaternary.....	40

2.3. Subsurface stratigraphy	45
2.3.1. Stratigraphy.....	45
2.3.1.1. Paleozoic.....	45
2.3.1.2. Mesozoic	45
2.3.1.3. Cenozoic	53
2.4. Structural setting	57
2.5. Geologic history	61
2.5.1. Post-Middle Miocene phase.....	62
2.5.2. Pliocene phase	62
2.5.3. Pleistocene phase.....	62
2.5.4. Jurassic phase	63
2.5.5. Cretaceous phase.....	63
Chapter 3.....	65
REMOTE SENSING ANALYSIS AND SURFACE STRUCTURES	65
3.1. Introduction	65
3.2. Remote sensed data Analysis	70
3.2.1. Image enhancement	77
3.2.1.1. Contrast enhancement	77
3.2.2. Information extraction.....	81
3.2.2.1. Principle component analysis (PCA)	81
3.2.2.2. Ratio Image	84
3.2.2.3. Data Classification:	96
3.2.1. Topographic analysis and lineament extraction	113
3.2.1.1. Digital elevation model analysis	113
3.2.1.1. Edge enhancement:.....	118
3.3. digital geological mapping with surface structure elements.	121
Chapter 4. SEISMIC INTERPRETATION AND SUBSURFACE STRUCTURE.....	129
4.1. Introduction	129
4.2. Methodology.....	130
4.3. Available seismic and well logs Data:	132
4.4 Seismic data acquisition	133

4.5. Seismic data processing.....	133
.4.6 Well Log Data.....	133
4.7. Seismic Interpretation.....	136
4.8. Structure Contour Maps:	138
4.9. Geo-Seismic Cross Sections:.....	150
4.10. Subsurface Structures:	155
4.10.1. Faults	155
4.10.1.1. Dip-slip faults	156
.4.10.1.2 Strike-slip faults.....	156
.4.10.1 Unconformities	156
4.10.2. Folds	157
Chapter 5. GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM (GIS).....	172
.5.1 Introduction:	172
.5.2 GIS Thematic Data Processing	173
5.2.1. GIS Data Automation 1:	174
5.2.2. GIS Data Automation 2:	174
5.3. Specialized Earth Sensing:.....	175
.5.4 Factors Affecting the Success of GIS:	178
5.5. The data set:	178
5.6. The data organization:.....	179
5.6.1. Model:	179
5.6.2. Criteria:	179
.5.7 Data manipulation and analysis.....	180
Chapter 6. RELAIOnSHIP BETWEEN SURFACE AND SUBSURFACE STRUCTURES	185
6.1. Introduction	185
6.2. Surface Structural Elements:.....	185
6.3. Subsurface Structural Features.....	189
6.4. Relation between Surface and Subsurface Structural Implications.	193
6.5. Vertical Evolution of Structural Deformations.....	196
.6.6 Areal Structural Model.....	198

6.7. Structural Trends Aging.....	204
6.8. Petroleum system.....	204
6.8.1. Source rocks.....	204
6.8.2. Reservoir rocks.....	206
6.8.3. Seal rocks.....	207
6.8.4. Traps.....	208
Chapter 7. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PALEOTECTONICS AND NEOTECTONICS	212
.7.1 Introduction:	212
7.2. Tectonic Adjustments	212
7.2.1. Thickness Maps	215
7.2.2. Isopach maps.....	215
7.2.2.1. Isochore map.....	215
7.3. Paleo-tectonic Trends	227
7.3.1. NNW-SSE and NNE-SSW trends:.....	227
7.3.2. NE-SW trend:.....	227
7.3.3. NW-SE trend:.....	228
7.3.4. E-W trend:.....	229
7.4. Neo-Tectonic Trends:.....	230
7.4.1. N-S trend:.....	230
7.5. Vertical Evolution of Tectonic Deformation	231
7.6. Tectonic Ages:	233
7.7. Areal Tectonic Model:.....	236
7.8. Relation between Paleotectonics and Neotectonics	240
Chapter 8. Summary and Conclusion.....	242
8.1. Summary and Conclusion	242
Chapter 9. References	256

LIST OF FIGURE

Figure 1: Location of the study area and Distribution of Sedimentary basins in the northern Western Desert, Egypt (modified after Mesherf, 1996)

Figure 2: Legacy seismic data example from the Matruh Canyon showing the Cretaceous shale decollement (green) and Cretaceous raft structures (light green) which could be sourced from the deeper source rock. (Source: PGS)

Figure 3: Legacy seismic data example from the Shelf area, an extension of the onshore Western Desert Basin with a proven petroleum system. (Source: PGS)

Figure 4: Location map of the study area oilfields and their surrounding area, after Apache company report 2006-2009.

Figure 5: The main geomorphologic units of the study area and its surroundings, northwestern coast (after Moussa, 1976).

Figure 5: The main geomorphologic units of the study area showing location of different soil deposits (after GMSA internal report, 2001).

Figure 7: Generalized geologic map of Egypt, 2008, showing the study area.

Figure 8 A): Geologic maps of the two pilot areas, derived from the landsat images, field investigation and Conoco geologic map (1986), after Yousif, et al. (2015).

Figure 8 B): The geological map of the Geological Survey of Egypt (scale 1:100.000) for the study area, 2001.

Figure 9: Generalized lithostratigraphic column of the northern part of the Western Desert (EGPC, 1992).

Figure 10: Map showing the spatial distribution of the main east-west sedimentary basin and major tectonics in the northern Western Desert, Egypt, (Bayoumi, 1996).

Figure11: An illustration for the approximate wavelengths of Landsat 7, ASTER and Hyperion sensors.

Figure 12: Signal to Noise characteristics of the Hyperion Instrument.

Figure 13: Flow chart for the applied satellite image processing procedures.

Figure 14: The Landsat ETM+ scene used in this study, with their path/row coordinates.

Figure 15: Instrument Ground tracks for the Landsat 7 Enhanced Thematic Mapper Plus (ETM+) Sensor and the three EO-1 sensors: the Advanced Land Imager (ALI), Hyperion,).Hyperion is a push-broom imaging sensor with a swath width of 7.5 km. The EO-1 platform was positioned on orbit to be approximately one minute behind the Landsat 7 ETM+ sensor at an altitude of 705km.

Figure 16: The result Landsat TM+ image (Band 5, 3, 1 in RGB).

Figure 17: Landsat ETM+ image (Bands 5, 3, 1 in RGB), with equalization enhancement.

Figure 18: Landsat ETM+ principle Component Analysis images for the individual bands (PC2, PC3 and PC4) of the study area.

Figure 19: Landsat ETM+ false color composite principle component analysis image (PC2, PC3 and PC4 in RGB) of the study area.

Figure 20: Landsat ETM+ band ratio image of Band 3/Band 1.

Figure 21: Landsat ETM+ band ratio image of Band 4/Band 5.

Figure 22: Landsat ETM+ band ratio image of Band 5/Band 7.

Figure 23: Landsat ETM+ band ratio image of Bands 4/5, 5/7, 3/1 in RGB respectively.

Figure 24: Band ratio Landsat TM+ for study area, ($R=B3/B1$, $G=B5/B7$ and $B=B4/B7$).

Figure 25: Band ratio (Band4/Band2) of Hyperion image (Ali) for study area.

Figure 26: Band ratio (Band7/Band5) of Hyperion image (Ali) for study area.

Figure 27: Band ratio (Band8/Band9) of Hyperion image (Ali) for study area.

Figure 28: Band ratio ($R=B4/B2$, $G=B8/B9$, $B=B9/B3$) of Hyperion image (Ali) for study area.

Figure 29:

- a) Band ratio of hyperion EO1 data for silica discrimination, ($B195/B220$).
- b) Band ratio of hyperion EO1 data for carbonate discrimination, ($B205/B218$).

Figure 30: band ratio($R=205/218$, $G=195/220$, $B=207/220$) OF Hyperion EO1 image for study area.

Figure 31: Spectral signatures of different target rocks and minerals.

Figure 32: Unsupervised classification for the Landsat of study area.

Figure 33: Supervised classification Landsat ETM+ image for the study area.

Figure 34: Supervised classification of Hyperion EO1 image of study area.

Figure 35: Supervised classification oh Hyperion Ali image for the study area.

Figure 36: Comparison of the Hyperion, Ali, and Landsat ETM supervised classification maps.

Figure 37: Comparison of the EO-1 Hyperion, and Landsat ETM supervised classification maps.

Figure 38: Digital model shows the hill shading effect of the study

Figure 39: PCI 3D view created from SRTM data, show the main geomorphologic units of the study area.

Figure 40: Slope map of the study area.

Figure 41: Aspect map of the study area.

Figure 42: Resulting image of high-pass filter (5×5) with directional Azimuth 90 degree.

Figure 43: Resulting image of high-pass filter (5×5) with directional Azimuth 180 degree

Figure 44: The PCI image showing linear features of the study area and its resulted rose diagram.

Figure 45: Lineament map of the study area interpreted from the remote sensing data analysis.

Figure 46: Geological map of the study area interpreted from the remote sensing data analysis.

Figure 47: Lineament map of the classified Hyperion (EO1) map interpreted from the remote sensing data analysis.

Figure 48: Lineament map of the classified Ali Hyperion map interpreted from the remote sensing data analysis.

Figure 49: Flow chart for the applied seismic interpretation procedure.

Figure 50: Seismic shot points location map of the study area and the locations of the used wells

Figure 51: The logs of the 9 boreholes representing the stratigraphy of the study area and the stratigraphic position of the principal reflectors identified on the seismic sections.

Figure 52: Structure depth map on top Moghra Formation of the study area, contour interval = 200 ft.

Figure 53: Structure depth map on top Apollonia of the study area.

Figure 54: Structure depth map on top Khoman of the study area.

Figure 55: Structure depth map on top Abu Roash "A" of the study area.

Figure 56: Structure depth map on top Abu Roash "F" of the study area.

Figure 57: Structure depth map on top Upper Bahariya of the study area

Figure 59: Structure depth map on top Upper Safa of the study area

Figure 58: Structure depth map on top Alamein Dolomite of the study area.

Figure 60: SSE- ENE geo-seismic cross-section through Faghur-5, Faghur-6, Khnum-01, and Phiops-01wells.

Figure 61: NE-SW geo-seismic cross-section through Halafaya -1, Khnum-01, and Phiops -01wells.

Figure 62: N-S geo-seismic cross-section through Nest-01, Khnum-01 and Phiops -01 wells.

Figure 63: E-W geo-seismic cross-section through NEST-01, HALFAYA -1, EL NOOR -1 and SALLUM-E01wells.

Figure 64: Seismic section (ESB96-5) showing the structural style of the study area.

Figure 65: Seismic section (AR_89_28SB) showing the structural style of the study area (horst and graben) and fault timing.

Figure 66: Seismic section (ESB96-11) showing the structural style of the study area. Figure 67: Seismic section (ESB96-32) showing the structural style of the study area (horst and graben)